

PCF THEORY: APPLICATIONS

SAHARON SHELAH

Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel

Rutgers University
Department of Mathematics
New Brunswick, NJ USA

ABSTRACT. We deal with several pcf problems; we characterize another version of exponentiation: number of κ -branches in a tree with λ nodes, deal with existence of independent sets in stable theories, possible cardinalities of ultraproducts and the depth of ultraproducts of Boolean Algebras. Also we give cardinal invariants for each λ with a pcf restriction and investigate further $T_D(f)$. The sections can be read independently.

Partially supported by the basic research fund, Israeli Academy
This version came from sections of Sh580
I thank Alice Leonhardt for the excellent typing
Latest Revision - 98/Apr/10
Pub. No. 589
Saharon references to 513:p.32,34, see §2 4.8

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ -TEX

ANNOTATED CONTENT

§1 T_D via true cofinalities

[Assume D is a filter on κ , $\mu = \text{cf}(\mu) > 2^\kappa$, $f \in {}^\kappa\text{Ord}$, and: D is $\aleph_1$ -complete or $(\forall \sigma < \mu)(\sigma^{\aleph_0} < \mu)$. We prove that if $T_D(f) \geq \mu$ (i.e. there are $f_\alpha <_D f$ for $\alpha < \mu$ such that $f_\alpha \not\equiv_D f_\beta$ for $\alpha < \beta < \mu$) then for some $A \in D^+$ and regular $\lambda_i \in (2^\kappa, f(i)]$ we have: μ is the true cofinality of $\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i / (D + A)$].

§2 The tree revised power

[We characterize by pcf more natural cardinal functions. The main one is $\lambda^{\kappa, \text{tr}}$, the supremum on the number of κ -branches of trees with λ nodes, where κ is regular uncountable. If $\lambda > \kappa^{\kappa, \text{tr}}$ it is the supremum on $\max \text{pcf}\{\theta_\zeta : \zeta < \kappa\}$ for an increasing sequence $\langle \theta_\zeta : \zeta < \kappa \rangle$ of regular cardinals with $\zeta < \kappa \Rightarrow \lambda \geq \max \text{pcf}\{\theta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta\}$].

§3 On the depth behaviour for ultraproducts

[We deal with a problem of Monk on the depth of ultraproducts of Boolean algebras; this continues [Sh 506, §3]. We try to characterize for a filter D on κ and $\lambda_i = \text{cf}(\lambda_i) > 2^\kappa$, and $\mu = \text{cf}(\mu)$, when does $(\forall i < \kappa)[\lambda_i \leq \text{Depth}^+(B_i)] \Rightarrow \mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i / D)$ (where $\text{Depth}^+(B) = \cup\{\mu^+ : \text{in } B \text{ there is an increasing sequence of length } \mu\}$). When D is $\aleph_1$ -complete or $(\forall \sigma < \mu)[\sigma^{\aleph_0} < \mu]$ the characterization is reasonable: for some $A \in D^+$ and $\lambda'_i = \text{cf}(\lambda'_i) < \lambda_i$ we have $\mu = \text{tcf} \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda'_i / (D + A)$. We then proceed

to look at $\text{Depth}_h^{(+)}$ (closing under homomorphic images), and with more work succeed. We use results from §1].

§4 On existence of independent sets for stable theories

[Bays [Bays Ph.D.] has continued work in [Sh:c] on existence of independent sets (in the sense of non-forking) for stable theories.

We connect those problems to pcf and shed some light. Note that the combinatorial Claim 4.1 continues [Sh 430, §3].

§5 Cardinal invariants for general cardinals: restriction on the depth

[We show that some (natural) cardinal invariants defined for any regular $\lambda (> \aleph_0)$, as functions of λ satisfies inequalities coming from pcf (more accurately norms for $\aleph_1$ -complete filters). They are variants of depth, supremum of length of sequences from ${}^\lambda\lambda$, increasing in suitable sense and also the supremum on λ -MAD families. Contrast this with Cummings Shelah [CuSh 541]. Also we connect pcf and the ideal $I[\lambda]$; see 5.20].

§6 The class of cardinal ultraproducts mod D

[Let D be an ultrafilter on κ and let

$\text{reg}(D) = \min\{\theta : D \text{ is not } \theta \text{ regular}\}$, so $\text{reg}(D)$ is regular itself. We prove

that if $\mu = \mu^{\text{reg}(\theta)} + 2^\kappa$ then μ can be represented as $|\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i/D|$, and for suitable μ 's get μ -like such ultraproducts].

§1 T_D VIA TRUE COFINALITY

We improve here results of [Sh 506, §3]. See more related things in §6. Our main result is 1.6.

1.1 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) J is an $\aleph_1$ -complete ideal on κ
- (b) $f \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$, each $f(i)$ an infinite ordinal
- (c) $T_J^2(f) \geq \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > \mu \geq \kappa$ (see 1.2(1) below)
- (d) $\mu = 2^\kappa$, or at least
 - (d)⁻(i) if $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \text{Reg}$, and
 $(\forall \theta \in \mathfrak{a})(\mu \leq \theta < \lambda \ \& \ \mu \leq \theta < \sup_{i < \kappa} f(i))$
 and $|\mathfrak{a}| \leq \kappa$, then $|\text{pcf}(\mathfrak{a})| \leq \mu$
 - (ii) $|\mu^\kappa/J| < \lambda$
 - (iii) $2^\kappa < \lambda$.

Then for some $A \in J^+$ and $\bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_i : i \in A \rangle$ such that $\mu \leq \lambda_i = \text{cf}(\lambda_i) \leq f(i)$ we have $\prod_{i \in A} \lambda_i / (J \upharpoonright A)$ has true cofinality λ .

1.2 Remark. 1) Remember $T_J^2(f) = \text{Min}\{|F| : F \subseteq \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i) \text{ and for every}$

$g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)$ for some $g' \in F$ we have $\neg(g \neq_J g')\}$. The inverse of the claim is immediate.

- 2) If $A_1 = \{i < \kappa : f(i) \geq \lambda\} \in J^+$ then the conclusion is immediate, with $\lambda_i = \lambda$.
- 3) Note if $A_2 = \{i < \kappa : f(i) < (2^\kappa)^+\} \in J^+$ then $T_J^2(f) \leq 2^\kappa$. If in addition $\kappa \setminus A_2 \in J$ then any λ satisfying the conclusion satisfies $\lambda \leq 2^\kappa$.
- 4) We can omit the assumption clause (d)⁻(iii) and weaken (here and in 2.6) the assumption “ $|\mu^\kappa/J| < \lambda$ ” (in clause (d)⁻) we can just ask:

$\oplus_{J, \mu, \lambda}$ there is $F \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ of cardinality $< \lambda$ such that for every $g \in {}^\kappa \mu$ we can find $F' \subseteq F$ of cardinality $\leq \mu$ such that for every $A \in J^+$ for some $f \in F'$ we have $\{i \in A : g(i) = f(i)\} \in J^+$, or even

$\oplus_{J, \mu, \lambda}^-$ we require the above only for all $g \in G$, where $G \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ has cardinality $< \lambda$ and: if $\langle \theta_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is a sequence of regulars in $[\aleph_0, \mu]$ and $g' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \theta_i$ then for some $g'' \in G$ we have $g' <_J g'' <_J \langle \theta_i : i < \kappa \rangle$.

Considering (d)⁻(iii) in the proof we weaken $g_n \upharpoonright A \in N$ for some $g', A' \subseteq \kappa$ from $g_n \upharpoonright A =_J g' \upharpoonright A'$.

5) Also in 1.6 and 1.7 we can replace the assumption $\lambda > 2^\kappa$ by the existence of μ satisfying $\lambda > \mu \geq \kappa$ such that (d)⁻ as weakened above holds.

6) Note that we do not ask $(\forall \alpha < \lambda)[|\alpha|^{< \text{reg}(J)} < \lambda]$.

7) Of course, we can apply the claim to $J \upharpoonright A$ for every $A \in J^+$ hence $\{A/J : A \in J^+\}$

$A \in J^+$, and for some $\bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_i : i \in A \rangle$ such that $\mu \leq \lambda_i = \text{cf}(\lambda_i) \leq f(i)$ we have $\prod_{i \in A} \lambda_i / (J \upharpoonright A)$ has true cofinality λ is dense in the Boolean Algebra $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/J$.

1.3 Remark. The changes in the proof required for weakening in 1.1 the clause $|\mu^\kappa/J| < \lambda$ to $\bigoplus_{J, \mu, \lambda}^-$ from 1.2(4) are as follows.

As $J, \mu, \lambda \in N$ there are $F \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu, G \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ as required in $\bigoplus_{J, \mu, \lambda}^-$ belonging to N (hence $\subseteq N$). After choosing $g^{n,1}$ and B_n apply the assumption on G to $g^{n,3} \in {}^\kappa\mu$ when $g^{n,3} \upharpoonright B_n = (g^{n,2} \upharpoonright B_n)$ and $g^{n,3} \upharpoonright (\kappa \setminus B_n)$ is constantly zero and $\theta = \langle \theta_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ where $\theta_i = \text{cf}(g_n(i))$ if $i \in B_n$ and $\theta_i = \aleph_0$ if $i \in \kappa \setminus B_n$.

So we get some $g^{n,4} \in G$ such that $g^{n,3} <_J g^{n,4} <_J \langle \theta_i : i < \kappa \rangle$. As $G \in N$, $|G| < \lambda$ clearly $G \subseteq N$ hence $g^{n,4} \in G$. Let F'_n be a subset of F of cardinality $\leq \mu$ such that: for every $A \in J^+$ for some $f \in F'_n$ we have $\{i \in A : g^{n,4}(i) = f(i)\} \in J^+$.

Now continue as there but defining g_{n+1} use $g^{n,4}$ instead $g^{n,3}$ and choose $\mathcal{P}_{n+1}^1$ as

$$\left\{ \{i < \kappa : g^{n,4}(i) = f(i)\} : f \in F'_n \right\}.$$

The rest is straight.

Remember

1.4 Fact. Assume

- (a) $N \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in, <_\chi^*)$ and $\mu < \lambda < \chi$ and $\{\mu, \lambda\} \in N$,
- (b) $N \cap \lambda$ is an ordinal,
- (c) $i^* \leq \mu$, and for $i < i^*$ we have $\mathfrak{a}_i \subseteq \text{Reg} \setminus \mu^+, |\mathfrak{a}_i| \leq \mu, \theta_i \in \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{a}_i) \cap \lambda$ and $(\mathfrak{a}_i, \theta_i) \in N$, and let $\mathfrak{a} = \bigcup_{i < i^*} \mathfrak{a}_i$.

Then

- (*) for every $g \in \Pi \mathfrak{a}$ there is f such that:
 - (α) $g < f \in \Pi \mathfrak{a}$
 - (β) $f \upharpoonright \mathfrak{b}_{\theta_i}[\mathfrak{a}_i] \in N$, and if $\theta_i = \max \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{a}_i)$ we have $f \upharpoonright \mathfrak{a}_i \in N$.

Proof. By [Sh:g, Ch.II,3.4] or [Sh:g, VIII,§1].

Proof of 1.1. Note that assuming $2^\kappa < \lambda$ slightly simplify the proof, as then we can demand $g_{A,n} = g_n \upharpoonright A$. Assume toward contradiction that the conclusion fails. Without loss of generality $i < \kappa \Rightarrow f(i) > 0$. Let χ be large enough, and let N be an elementary submodel of $(\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in, <_\chi^*)$ of cardinality $< \lambda$ such that $\{f, \lambda, \mu\}$ belongs to N and $N \cap \lambda$ is an ordinal and if we assume only clause (d)¹ then¹

- ☒ for every $f \in {}^\kappa\mu$ for some $g \in N \cap {}^\kappa\mu$ such that $f = g \bmod J$ (if $J \in N$ this is immediate).

¹note we did not forget to ask $J \in N$, we just want to help reading this as a proof of 1.5, too; for the case $2^{|J|} \geq \lambda$ so there J' does not necessarily belong to N .

So we shall prove $F =: \left(\prod_{i < \kappa} f(i) \right) \cap N$ exemplifies that $T_J^2(f) \leq |F|(< \lambda)$, thus giving a contradiction

So it suffices to prove

- (*) for every $g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)$ for some $g' \in F$ we have $\neg(g \neq_J g')$ i.e.
 $\{i < \kappa : g'(i) = g(i)\} \in J^+$.

Assume $g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)$ exemplifies the failure of (*).

We now define by induction on $n < \omega$ the function g_n and the family $\mathcal{P}_n$ such that:

- (i) $g_0 = f, g_n \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$, and $g \leq g_n$
- (ii) $g_{n+1} < g_n \text{ mod } J$
- (iii) $\mathcal{P}_n$ is a family of $\leq \mu$ members of J^+
- (iv) if $A \in \mathcal{P}_n$ then $g_n \restriction A \in N$ hence $A \in N$ but if $2^\kappa \geq \lambda$ we just assume that for some $g_{A,n} \in \prod_{i \in A} f(i)$ we have $g_{A,n} = g_n \restriction A \text{ mod } J$ and $g_{A,n} \in N$ hence $A \in N$
- (v) $\mathcal{P}_0 = \{\kappa\}$
- (vi) if $A \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $B \subseteq A$ and $B \in J^+$ then for some $A' \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1}$ we have $A' \subseteq A$ & $A' \cap B \in J^+$
- (vii) $g < g_n \text{ mod } J$
- (viii) $g(i) \leq g_n(i)$ and $g(i) < g_n(i) \Rightarrow g_{n+1}(i) < g_n(i)$
 and $g(i) = g_n(i) \Rightarrow g(i) = g_{n+1}(i)$
 (not necessary for 1.1).

If we succeed as “ J is $\aleph_1$ -complete (see assumption (a))” then by clause (ii) we get a contradiction as $<_J$ is well founded. Also the case $n = 0$ is easy by (i) + (v).

(Note: Clause (vii) holds as $g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)$). So assume we have $g_n, \mathcal{P}_n$ and we

shall define $g_{n+1}, \mathcal{P}_{n+1}$. In N there is a two-place function $\mathbf{e}$, written $\mathbf{e}_\delta(i), \mathbf{e}_\delta(i)$ is defined iff $\delta \in \{\alpha : \alpha \text{ a non-zero ordinal } \leq \sup_{i < \kappa} f(i)\}$, and $i < \text{cf}(\delta)$, and if δ

is a limit ordinal, then $\langle \mathbf{e}_\delta(i) : i < \text{cf}(\delta) \rangle$ is strictly increasing with limit δ and $\mathbf{e}_{\alpha+1}(0) = \alpha$, of course, $\text{Dom}(\mathbf{e}_{\alpha+1}) = \{0\}$.

We also know by assumption (d) or (d)⁻(i) that

- $\otimes$ for every $A \in \mathcal{P}_n$ we have, letting $\mathfrak{a}_A^n =: \{\text{cf}(g_{A,n}(i)) : i \in A\} \setminus \mu^+$, the set $\text{pcf}(\mathfrak{a}_A^n)$ has at most μ members.

So $\mathcal{Y} =: \{(A, \mathfrak{a}_A^n, \theta) : A \in \mathcal{P}_n \text{ and } \theta \in \lambda \cap \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{a}_A^n)\}$ has at most $|\mathcal{P}_n| \times \mu \leq \mu \times \mu = \mu$ members (as $|\mathcal{P}_n| \leq \mu$ and $|\text{pcf}(\mathfrak{a}_A^n)| \leq \mu$ by $\otimes$ above) so let $\{(A_\varepsilon^n, \mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon^n, \theta_\varepsilon^n) : \varepsilon < \varepsilon_n^*\}$ list them with $\varepsilon_n^* \leq \mu$. Clearly $\mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon^n \in N$ (as $g_{A,n} \restriction A_\varepsilon^n \in N$ hence $\mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon^n \in N$ but $\mu + 1 \subseteq N, |\text{pcf}(\mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon^n)| \leq \mu$ so $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq N$). For each $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_n^*$ we define $h_\varepsilon^n \in \Pi \mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon^n$ by:

$$h_\varepsilon^n(\theta) = \text{Min} \left\{ \zeta < \theta : \text{if } i \in A_\varepsilon^n, g(i) < g_n(i), \text{ and } \right. \\ \left. \theta = \text{cf}(g_n(i)) \text{ then } g(i) < \mathbf{e}_{g_n(i)}(\zeta) \right\}.$$

[Why is h_ε^n well defined? The number of possible i 's is $\leq |A_\varepsilon^n| \leq \kappa \leq \mu$, for each i (satisfying $i \in A_\varepsilon^n, g(i) < g_n(i)$ and $\text{cf}(g_n(i)) > \mu$), every $\zeta < \theta$ large enough is OK as $\langle \mathbf{e}_{g_n(i)}(\zeta) : \zeta < \theta \rangle$ is increasing continuous with limit $g_n(i)$). Lastly, $\theta = \text{cf}(\theta) > \mu$ (by the choice of $\mathbf{a}_\varepsilon^n$) so all the demands together hold for every large enough $\zeta < \theta$].

Let $\mathbf{a}_n = \bigcup_{\varepsilon < \varepsilon_n^*} \mathbf{a}_\varepsilon^n$ and let $h_n \in \Pi \mathbf{a}_n$ be defined by $h_n(\theta) = \sup\{h_\varepsilon^n(\theta) : \varepsilon < \varepsilon_n^* \text{ and } \theta \in \mathbf{a}_\varepsilon^n\}$, it is well defined by the argument above. So by 1.4 there is a function $g^{n,1} \in \Pi \mathbf{a}_n$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha) \quad & h_n < g^{n,1} \\ (\beta) \quad & g^{n,1} \upharpoonright \mathbf{b}_{\theta_\varepsilon^n}[\mathbf{a}_\varepsilon^n] \in N \text{ (and } \theta_\varepsilon^n = \max \text{pcf}(\mathbf{a}_\varepsilon^n) \Rightarrow \mathbf{b}_{\theta_\varepsilon^n}[\mathbf{a}_\varepsilon^n] = \mathbf{a}_\varepsilon^n). \end{aligned}$$

Also we can define $g^{n,2} \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$ by:

$$g^{n,2}(i) = \text{Min}\{\zeta < \text{cf}(g_n(i)) : \mathbf{e}_{g_n(i)}(\zeta) \geq g(i)\}.$$

So letting $B_n = \{i : 1 \leq \text{cf}(g_n(i)) \leq \mu\}$ clearly $g^{n,2} \upharpoonright B_n \in {}^{(B_n)}\mu$. Now if assumption (d) holds, then $\mu^\kappa/J < \lambda$, hence $\mu^\kappa \subseteq N$ so we can find $g^{n,3} \in N$ such that $g^{n,2} = g^{n,3} \bmod (J + (\kappa \setminus B_n))$; if assumption (d) fails we still can get such $g^{n,3}$ by $\boxtimes$ above. Lastly, we define $g_{n+1} \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$:

$$g_{n+1}(i) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_{g_n(i)}(g^{n,1}(\text{cf}(g_n(i)))) & \text{if } \text{cf}(g_n(i)) > \mu \text{ and } g_n(i) > g(i) \\ \mathbf{e}_{g_n(i)}(g^{n,3}(\text{cf}(g_n(i)))) & \text{if } \text{cf}(g_n(i)) \in [1, \mu] \text{ and } g_n(i) > g(i) \\ g_n(i) & \text{if } g(i) = g_n(i) \end{cases}$$

and $\mathcal{P}_{n+1} = (\mathcal{P}_{n+1}^0 \cup \mathcal{P}_{n+1}^1) \setminus J$ where

$$\mathcal{P}_{n+1}^0 = \left\{ \{i \in A_\varepsilon^n : \text{cf}(g_{A_\varepsilon^n, n}(i)) \in \mathbf{b}_{\theta_\varepsilon^n}[\mathbf{a}_\varepsilon^n]\} : \varepsilon < \varepsilon_n^* \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}_{n+1}^1 = \left\{ \{i < \kappa : i \in A^* \text{ and } \text{cf}(g_{A^*, n}(i)) \leq \mu\} : A^* \in \mathcal{P}_n \right\}.$$

(Note: possibly $\mathcal{P}_{n+1} \cap J \neq \emptyset$, i.e. $(\mathcal{P}_{n+1}^0 \cup \mathcal{P}_{n+1}^1) \cap J = \emptyset$ but this does not make problems).

So let us check clauses (i) – (viii).

Clause (i): Trivial.

Clause (ii): By the definition of $g_{n+1}(i)$ above it is $< g_n(i)$ except when $g_n(i) = g(i)$, but by clause (vii) we know that $g < g_n \bmod J$ hence necessarily $A = \{i < \kappa : g_n(i) = 0\} \in J$, so really $g_{n+1} < g_n \bmod J$.

Clause (iii): $|\mathcal{P}_{n+1}| \leq |\mathcal{P}_n| + |\varepsilon_n^*| + \aleph_0$ and $|\mathcal{P}_n| \leq \mu$ by clause (iii) for n (i.e. the induction hypothesis) and during the construction we show that $|\varepsilon_n^*| = |\mathcal{Y}| \leq \mu$.

Clause (iv): let $A \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1}$ so we have two cases.

Case 1: $A \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1}^0$.

So for some $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_n^*$ we have $(\theta_\varepsilon^n \in \lambda \cap pcf(\mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon^n) \text{ and } A =: \{i \in A_\varepsilon^n : cf(g_{A_\varepsilon^n, n}(i)) \in \mathfrak{b}_{\theta_\varepsilon^n}[\mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon^n]\})$. Let $g_{A, n+1} \in \prod_{i \in A} f(i)$ be defined by $g_{A, n+1}(i) = e = g_{A_\varepsilon^n, n}(\varepsilon)(g^{n,1}(cf(g_{A_\varepsilon^n, n}(i))))$.

By the choice of $g^{n,1} \in \Pi \mathfrak{a}_n$ we have:

$$g^{n,1} \restriction \mathfrak{b}_{\theta_\varepsilon^n}[\mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon^n] \in N.$$

Now the set A is definable from $A_\varepsilon^n, g_{A_\varepsilon^n, n} : \mathfrak{b}_{\theta_\varepsilon^n}[\mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon^n]$ all of which belongs to N hence $A \in N$. Also $A_\varepsilon^n \in N$ and clearly $g_{A, n+1}$ is definable from the functions $g^{n,1} \restriction \mathfrak{b}_{\theta_\varepsilon^n}[\mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon^n], g^{n,2}, g_{A_\varepsilon^n, n}, A_\varepsilon^n$ and the function $\mathbf{e}$ (see the definition of g_{n+1} by cases), but all four are from N so $g_{A, n+1} \in N$. Lastly, $g_{n+1} \restriction A \equiv_J g_{A, n}$ as $i \in A$ & $g_{A_\varepsilon^n, n}(i) = g_n(i)$ & $g_n(i) > g(i) \Rightarrow g_{n+1}(i) = g_{A, n+1}(i)$ and each of the three assumptions fail only for a st of $i \in A$ which belongs to J .

Case 2: $A \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1}^1$.

So for some $A^* \in \mathcal{P}_n$ we have

$$A = \{i < \kappa : i \in A^* \text{ and } cf(g_{A^*, n}(i)) \leq \mu\}.$$

Let $g_{A, n+1}(i) \equiv \mathbf{e}_{g_{A, n}}(g^{n,3}(cf(g_{A^*, n}(i))))$. Again, $g_{A, n+1} \in N, g_{A, n+1} \equiv_J g_{n+1} \restriction A$. Looking at the definition of $g_{A, n+1}$, clearly $g_{A, n}$ is definable from $g^{n,2} \in N, g_{A^*, n}$ and the function $\mathbf{e}$, all of which belong to N .

Clause (v): Holds trivially.

Clause (vi): Assume $A \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $B \subseteq A$ satisfies $B \in J^+$ (so also $A \in J^+$), we have to find $A' \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1}$, such that $A' \subseteq A$ & $A' \cap B \in J^+$.

Case 1: $B_1 = \{i \in B : cf(g_{A, n}(i)) \leq \mu\} \in J^+$.

In this case $A' =: \{i \in A : cf(g_{A, n}(i)) \leq \mu\} \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1}^1 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{n+1}$ and $A' \cap B \in J^+$ by the assumption of the case.

Case 2: For some $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_n^*$ we have $A = A_\varepsilon^n$ and

$$B_2 = \{i \in B : cf(g_{A, n}(i)) \in \mathfrak{b}_{\theta_\varepsilon^n}[\mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon^n]\} \in J^+.$$

In this case $A' =: \{i \in A : cf(g_{A, n}(i)) \in \mathfrak{b}_{\theta_\varepsilon^n}[\mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon^n]\} \in J^+$ belongs to $\mathcal{P}_{n+1}^1 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{n+1}$, is $\subseteq A$ and $B \cap A' \in J^+$ by the assumption of the case (remember $g <_J g_n$).

Case 3: Neither Case 1 nor Case 2.

So $B_3 = B \setminus B_1 \in J^+$ and let $\lambda_i = cf(g_{A, n}(i))$.

We shall show that $\prod_{i \in B_3} \text{cf}(g_{A,n}(i))/J$ is λ -directed. This suffices as letting $\lambda_i =: \text{cf}(g_{A,n}(i)) \in (\mu, f(i))$, by [Sh:g, II, §1] for some $\lambda'_i = \text{cf}(\lambda'_i) \leq \lambda_i$, we have $\liminf_{J \upharpoonright B_3} \langle \lambda'_i : i \in B_3 \rangle = \liminf_{J \upharpoonright B_3} \langle \lambda_i : i \in B_3 \rangle$ and $\lambda = \text{tcf} \prod_{i \in B_3} \lambda'_i/(J \upharpoonright B_3)$ and this shows that the conclusion of 1.1 holds, but we are under the assumption it fails so the λ -directedness really suffice.

Now $i \in B \setminus B_1 \Rightarrow \lambda_i = \text{cf}(g_n(i)) > \mu$; and if $\prod_{i \in B_3} \lambda_i/J$ is not λ -directed, by [Sh:g, I, §1] for some $B_4 \subseteq B_3$ and $\theta = \text{cf}(\theta) < \lambda$ we have: $B_4 \in J^+$ and $\prod_{i \in B_4} \lambda_i/J$ has true cofinality θ . Hence $\theta \in \text{pcf}\{\text{cf}(g_{A,n}(i)) : i \in A \text{ and } \text{cf}(g_n(i)) > \mu\}$, and as $\theta > \mu$, for some $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_n^*$ we have $A = A_\varepsilon^n$ and $\theta = \theta_\varepsilon^n$ so $A' = \{i \in A : \text{cf}(g_{A,n}(i)) \in \mathfrak{b}_{\theta_\varepsilon}[\mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon^n]\}$ is as required in case 2 on B_2 (note: we could have restricted ourselves to θ 's like that).

Clause (vii): By the choice of $g^{n,1}, g^{n,2}$ and g^n clearly $i < \kappa$ & $g(i) < g_n(i) \Rightarrow g(i) \leq g_{n+1}(i)$. As $g < g_n \text{ mod } D$ it suffices to prove $B =: \{i : g(i) = g_{n+1}(i)\} \in J$. If not, we choose by induction on $\ell \leq n+1$ a member B_ℓ of $\mathcal{P}_\ell$ such that $B_\ell \cap B \in J^+$. For $\ell = 0$ let $B_\ell = \kappa \in \mathcal{P}_0$, for $\ell + 1$ apply clause (vi) for ℓ (even when $\ell = n$ we have just proved it). So $B_{n+1} \cap B \in J^+$ and $g_{n+1} \upharpoonright (B_{n+1} \cap B) = g \upharpoonright (B_{n+1} \cap B)$ hence $\neg(g_{n+1} \upharpoonright B_{n+1} \neq_J g_n \upharpoonright B_{n+1})$ but $g_{n+1} \upharpoonright B_{n+1} \in N$ so we have contradicted the choice of g as contradicting (*).

Clause (viii): Easy. □_{1.1}

1.5 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) J is an ideal on κ
- (b) $f \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$, each $f(i)$ an infinite ordinal
- (c) $T_J^2(f) \geq \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > \mu > \kappa$
- (d) $\mu = (2^\kappa)^+$ or at least
- (d)⁻(i) if $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \text{Reg}$, and $(\forall \theta \in \mathfrak{a})(\mu \leq \theta < \lambda \text{ \& \> } \mu \leq \theta < f(i))$ and $|\mathfrak{a}| \leq \kappa$ then $|\text{pcf}(\mathfrak{a})| \leq \mu$
- (ii) $|\mu^\kappa/J| < \lambda \vee (\forall g \in {}^\kappa \mu)[|\Pi g/J| < \lambda]$ and μ is regular
- (e) $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{\aleph_0} < \lambda$.

Then for some $A \in J^+$ and $\bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_i : i \in A \rangle$ such that $\mu \leq \text{cf}(\lambda_i) = \lambda_i \leq f(i)$ we have $\prod_{i \in A} \lambda_i/J$ has true cofinality λ .

Proof. We repeat the proof of 1.1 but we choose N such that ${}^\omega N \subseteq N$, (possible by assumption (e) as λ is regular), and let $F =: (\prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)) \cap N$. If $2^\kappa < \lambda$ then clearly

$$F = \left\{ g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i) : \text{for some partition } \langle A_n : n < \omega \rangle \text{ of } \kappa \text{ and} \right.$$

$$g_n \in N \cap \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i) \text{ we have}$$

$$g = \bigcup_{n < \omega} (g_n \upharpoonright A_n) \left. \right\}.$$

Then assume $(*)$ (from the proof of 1.1) fails and $g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)$ exemplifies it and we let J' be the ideal $J' = \{A \subseteq \kappa : g \upharpoonright A = g' \upharpoonright A \text{ for some } g' \in F\}$.

Clearly J' is $\aleph_1$ -complete, $J' \subseteq J$ (as g is a counterexample to $(*)$) and the representation of F above) and we continue as there getting the conclusion for J' hence for J .

If $2^\kappa \geq \lambda$, so

$\otimes$ for $g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)$ and $A \in J^+$ we have $(i) \Leftrightarrow (ii)$ where:

- (i) there are $g'_n \in F$ for $n < \omega$ such that $\{i < \kappa : \bigvee_{n < \omega} g(i) = g'_n(i)\} \supseteq A \bmod J$
- (ii) for some $g' \in F$ we have $\{i < \kappa : g(i) = g'(i)\} \supseteq A \bmod J$

[why? $\Leftarrow$ is trivial; now $\Rightarrow$ holds as $g_n \in N$ also $\langle g_n : n < \omega \rangle \in N$ hence $\langle \{g_n(i) : n < \omega\} : i < \kappa \rangle \in N$ and use $\omega^\kappa/J \leq \mu^\kappa/J < \lambda$ (or just $\bigoplus_{J, \mu, \lambda}$ from 1.2(4).]

Let $g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)$ be such that $f \in N \cap \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i) \Rightarrow g \neq_J f$. Now we repeat the proof of 1.1 with our $\kappa, f, \lambda, N, F, g$ this time using the demands in clause (viii) (i.e. $g(i) \leq g_n(i)$). The proof does not change except that we do not get a contradiction from $n < \omega \Rightarrow g_{n+1} <_J g_n$. However, for each $i < \kappa$, $\langle g_n(i) : n < \omega \rangle$ is non-increasing (by clause (viii)) hence eventually constant and by that clause eventually equal to $g(i)$. So clause (i) of $\otimes$ above holds hence clause (ii) so we are done. $\square_{1.5}$

1.6 Conclusion. Assume J is an ideal on κ , $f \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$, $i < \kappa \Rightarrow f(i) > 2^\kappa$, $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > 2^\kappa$, and

$(*)$ J is $\aleph_1$ -complete or $(\forall \alpha < \lambda)(|\alpha|^{\aleph_0} < \lambda)$.

Then $(a) \Leftrightarrow (b) \Leftrightarrow (b)^+ \Leftrightarrow (c) \Leftrightarrow (c)^+$ where

- (a) for some $A \in J^+$ we have $T_{J \upharpoonright A}^2(f \upharpoonright A) \geq \lambda$
- (b) for some $A \in J^+$ and $\lambda_i = \text{cf}(\lambda_i) \in (2^\kappa, f(i)]$ (for $i \in A$) we have $\prod_{i \in A} \lambda_i / (J \upharpoonright A)$ is λ -directed

(b)⁺ like (b) but $\prod_{i \in A} \lambda_i / (J \upharpoonright A)$ has true cofinality λ

(c) for some $A \in J^+$, and $\bar{n} = \langle n_i : i < \kappa \rangle \in {}^\kappa \omega$ and ideal J^* on $A^* = \bigcup_{i \in A} (\{i\} \times n_i)$ satisfying

$$(\forall B \subseteq A)[B \in J \Leftrightarrow \bigcup_{i \in B} (\{i\} \times n_i) \in J^*]$$

and regular cardinals $\lambda_{(i,n)} \in (2^\kappa, f(i)]$ we have $\prod_{(i,n) \in A^*} \lambda_{(i,n)} / J^*$ is

λ -directed

(c)⁺ as in (c) but $\prod_{(i,n) \in A^*} \lambda_{(i,n)} / J^*$ has true cofinality λ .

Proof. Clearly $(b)^+ \Rightarrow (b)$, $(b) \Rightarrow (c)$, $(b)^+ \Rightarrow (c)^+$ and $(c)^+ \Rightarrow (c)$. Also $(b) \Rightarrow (b)^+$ by [Sh:g, II,1.5B], and similarly $(c) \Rightarrow (c)^+$. Now we prove $(c) \Rightarrow (a)$; let

$\lambda_i = \max\{\lambda_{(i,n)} : n < n_i\}$ and let g_i be a one-to-one function from

$\prod_{n < n_i} \lambda_{(i,n)}$ into λ_i and let $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be a $<_{J^*}$ -increasing sequence in

$\prod_{(i,n) \in A^*} \lambda_{(i,n)}$. Define $f_\alpha^* \in \prod_{i \in A} \lambda_i$ by $f_\alpha^*(i) = g_i(f_\alpha \upharpoonright (\{i\} \times n_i))$. So if $\alpha < \beta$, then

$$\left\{ i \in A : f_\alpha^*(i) = f_\beta^*(i) \right\} = \left\{ i : \bigwedge_{n < n_i} f_\alpha((i,n)) = f_\beta((i,n)) \right\}$$

so by the assumption on J^* we get $f_\alpha \neq_{J^*} f_\beta$ hence $\{f_\alpha^* : \alpha < \lambda\}$ is as required in clause (a).

Lastly $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$ by 1.1 (in the case J is $\aleph_1$ -complete) or 1.5 (in the case $(\forall \alpha < \lambda)(|\alpha|^{\aleph_0} < \lambda)$). We have gotten enough implications to prove the conclusions. $\square_{1.6}$

1.7 Conclusion. Let D be an ultrafilter on κ . If $\left| \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i) / D \right| \geq \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > 2^\kappa$

and $(\forall \alpha < \lambda)[|\alpha|^{\aleph_0} < \lambda]$, then for some regular $\lambda_i \leq f(i)$ (for $i < \kappa$) we have $\lambda = \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i / D)$.

Remark. On $|\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i / D|$, see [Sh 506, 3.9B].

§2 THE TREE REVISED POWER

2.1 Definition. For κ regular and $\lambda \geq \kappa$ let

$$\lambda^{\kappa, \text{tr}} = \sup\{|\lim_\kappa(T)| : T \text{ a tree with } \leq \lambda \text{ nodes and } \kappa \text{ levels}\}$$

where $\lim_\kappa(T)$ is the set of κ -branches of T ; and let when $\lambda \geq \mu \geq \kappa$ and $\theta \geq 1$

$$\lambda^{\langle \kappa, \theta \rangle} = \text{Min} \left\{ \mu : \text{if } T \text{ is a tree with } \lambda \text{ nodes and } \kappa \text{ levels,} \right. \\ \left. \text{then there is } \mathcal{P} \in [[T]^\theta]^\mu \text{ such that} \right. \\ \left. \eta \in \lim_\kappa(T) \Rightarrow (\exists A \in \mathcal{P})(\eta \subseteq A) \right\}.$$

$$\lambda^{\langle \kappa \rangle} = \lambda^{\langle \kappa, \kappa \rangle}.$$

Recall $[A]^\kappa =: \{B : B \subseteq A \text{ and } |B| = \kappa\}$.

2.2 Remark. 1) Clearly $\lambda^{\langle \kappa, \theta \rangle} \leq \lambda^{\kappa, \text{tr}} \leq \lambda^{\langle \kappa, \theta \rangle} + \theta^\kappa$.

2) If $\kappa = \aleph_0$ then obviously $\lambda^{\kappa, \text{tr}} = \lambda^\kappa$.

3) Of course, $\lambda^{\langle \kappa, \theta \rangle} \leq \text{cov}(\lambda, \theta^+, \kappa^+, \kappa)$ and $\kappa \leq \theta \leq \sigma \leq \lambda \Rightarrow \lambda^{\langle \kappa, \theta \rangle} \leq \lambda^{\langle \kappa, \sigma \rangle} + \text{cov}(\lambda, \theta^+, \kappa^+, \kappa)$. (See [Sh:g] if these concepts are unfamiliar.)

2.3 Theorem. *Let κ be regular uncountable $\leq \lambda$. Then the following cardinals are equal:*

- (i) $\lambda^{\langle \kappa \rangle}$
- (ii) $\lambda + \sup\{\max \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{a}) : \mathfrak{a} \subseteq \text{Reg} \cap \lambda \setminus \kappa, \mathfrak{a} = \{\theta_\zeta : \zeta < \kappa\} \text{ strictly increasing, and if } \xi < \kappa \text{ then } \max \text{pcf}(\{\theta_\zeta : \zeta < \xi\}) \leq \theta_\xi \leq \lambda\}.$

Proof. First inequality. Cardinal of (i) (i.e. $\lambda^{\langle \kappa \rangle}$) is $\leq$ cardinal of (ii).

Assume not and let μ be the cardinal from clause (ii) so $\mu \geq \lambda$.

Let T , a tree with κ levels and λ nodes, exemplify $\lambda^{\langle \kappa \rangle} > \mu$. Without loss of generality $T \subseteq {}^{\kappa} \lambda$ and $<_T = \triangleleft \upharpoonright T$.

Let $\{T, \kappa, \lambda, \mu\} \in \mathfrak{B}_n \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in_{<\chi}^*), \mu + 1 \subseteq \mathfrak{B}_n, \|\mathfrak{B}_n\| = \mu$ for $n < \omega$,

$\mathfrak{B}_n \in \mathfrak{B}_{n+1}, \mathfrak{B}_n \prec \mathfrak{B}_{n+1}$ and let $\mathfrak{B} =: \bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathfrak{B}_n$. So $\mathcal{P} =: \mathfrak{B} \cap [T]^{\leq \kappa}$ cannot

exemplify (i). So there is $\eta \in \lim_\kappa(T)$ such that $(\forall A \in \mathcal{P})[\{\eta \upharpoonright \zeta : \zeta < \kappa\}] \not\subseteq A$.

We choose by induction on n, N_n^0, N_n^1 such that:

- (a) $N_n^0 \prec N_n^1 \prec \mathfrak{B}_{3n}$
- (b) $N_0^1 = \text{Sk}_{\mathfrak{B}_0}(\{\zeta : \zeta < \kappa\} \cup \{\eta \upharpoonright \zeta : \zeta < \kappa\} \cup \{\kappa, \mu, \lambda, T\})$ and $N_0^0 = \text{Sk}_{\mathfrak{B}_0}(\{\zeta : \zeta < \kappa\} \cup \{\kappa, \mu, \lambda, T\})$
- (c) $\|N_n^\ell\| = \kappa$
- (d) $N_n^0 \in \mathfrak{B}_{n+1}$
- (e) $N_n^1 = \text{Sk}_{\mathfrak{B}_{3n}}(N_n^0 \cup \{\eta \upharpoonright \zeta : \zeta < \kappa\})$
- (f) $\theta \in \lambda^+ \cap \text{Reg} \cap N_{n+1}^0 \setminus \kappa^+ \Rightarrow \sup(N_{n+1}^0 \cap \theta) > \sup(N_n^1 \cap \theta)$.

Let us carry the induction.

For $n = 0$: No problem.

For $n + 1$: Let $\mathfrak{a} =: N_n^0 \cap \text{Reg} \cap \lambda^+ \setminus \kappa^+$, so $\mathfrak{a}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_{n+1}$ and $\mathfrak{a}^n$ is a set of cardinality $\leq \kappa$ of regular cardinals $\in (\kappa, \lambda^+)$.

Let $g^n \in \Pi \mathfrak{a}^n$ be defined by $g^n(\theta) =: \sup(N_n^1 \cap \theta)$.

(*)₁ It is enough to prove that $\mathfrak{a}^n$ is a member of

$$I^n = \{\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}^n : \text{for some } f \in (\Pi \mathfrak{a}^n) \cap \mathfrak{B}_{n+1} \text{ we have } g^n \restriction \mathfrak{b} < f\}$$

so we need to show $\mathfrak{a}^n \in I^n$.

Clearly

(*)₂ $J_{\leq \mu}[\mathfrak{a}^n] \subseteq I^n$ (in particular all singletons are in I^n).

Fact: There is $f^* \in \mathfrak{B}_{n+1} \cap \Pi \mathfrak{a}^n$ such that:

$$\mathfrak{b}^n =: \{\theta \in \mathfrak{a}^n : f^*(\theta) < g^n(\theta)\}$$

satisfies

$$[\mathfrak{b}^n]^{<\kappa} \subseteq J_{\leq \lambda}[\mathfrak{a}^n]$$

(yes! not $J_{\leq \mu}[\mathfrak{a}^n]$).

Proof. In $\mathfrak{B}_{n+1}$ there is a list $\{a_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \kappa\}$ of N_n^0 . For each $\nu \in T$ let ν be of level ζ and let $N_{n,\nu}^1 = \text{Sk}_{\mathfrak{B}_n}(\{(a_{n,\varepsilon}, \nu \restriction \varepsilon) : \varepsilon < \zeta\})$. So the function $\nu \mapsto N_{n,\nu}^1$ (i.e. the set of pairs $\langle \nu, N_{n,\nu}^1 \rangle : \nu \in T$) belongs to $\mathfrak{B}_{n+1}$. Clearly $\langle N_{n,\eta \restriction \zeta}^1 : \zeta < \kappa \rangle$ is increasing continuous with union N_n^1 . Let $g_{n,\nu}^1 \in \Pi(\mathfrak{a}^n \cap N_{n,\nu}^1)$ be defined by $g_{n,\nu}^1(\theta) = \sup(\theta \cap N_{n,\nu}^1)$, so $\{(\mathfrak{a}^n \cap N_{n,\nu}^1, g_{n,\nu}^1) : \nu \in T\} \in \mathfrak{B}_{n+1}$. Now $\Pi \mathfrak{a}^n / J_{\leq \lambda}[\mathfrak{a}^n]$ is λ^+ -directed, hence as $|T| \leq \lambda$ there is $f^* \in \Pi \mathfrak{a}^n$ such that:

$$(*)_3 \quad \nu \in T \Rightarrow g_{n,\nu}^1 <_{J_{\leq \lambda}[\mathfrak{a}^n]} f^*,$$

and by the previous sentence without loss of generality $f^* \in \mathfrak{B}_{n+1}$. Note that for $\theta \in \mathfrak{a}^n$ the sequence $\langle g_{n,\eta \restriction \zeta}^1(\theta) : \zeta < \kappa \rangle$ is non-decreasing with limit $g^n(\theta)$.

Let $\mathfrak{c} = \{\theta \in \mathfrak{a}^n : f^*(\theta) < g^n(\theta)\}$, now note

$$(*)_4 \quad \text{if } \theta \in \mathfrak{c} \text{ then for every } \zeta < \kappa \text{ large enough, } f^*(\theta) < g_{n,\eta \restriction \zeta}^1(\theta).$$

Hence $\mathfrak{c}' \in [\mathfrak{c}]^{<\kappa} \Rightarrow \mathfrak{c}' \in J_{\leq \lambda}[\mathfrak{a}^n]$ as required in the fact

(why the implication? because if $\mathfrak{c}' \subseteq \mathfrak{c}, |\mathfrak{c}'| < \kappa$ then by $(*)_4$ for some $\zeta < \kappa$ we have $f^* \restriction \mathfrak{c}' < g_{n,\eta \restriction \zeta}^1 \restriction \mathfrak{c}'$ which by $(*)_3$ gives $\mathfrak{c}' \in J_{\leq \lambda}[\mathfrak{a}^n]$). So let $\mathfrak{b}^n = \mathfrak{c}$. $\square_{\text{fact}}$

Now if $\mathfrak{b}^n$ is in $J_{\leq \mu}[\mathfrak{a}^n]$ by $(*)_1 + (*)_2$ above we can finish the induction step. If not, some $\tau^* \in \text{Reg} \setminus \mu^+$ satisfies $\tau^* \in \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{b}^n)$; let $\langle \mathfrak{c}_\zeta : \zeta < \kappa \rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of subsets of $\mathfrak{a}^n$ each of cardinality $< \kappa$ such that

$\mathfrak{b}^n = \bigcup_{\zeta < \kappa} \mathfrak{c}_\zeta$ and so (by the face above) $\zeta < \kappa \Rightarrow \tau^* > \lambda \geq \max \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{c}_\zeta)$. We

know that this implies that for some club E of κ and $\theta_\zeta \in \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{c}_\zeta)$, for $\zeta \in E$, $\tau^* \in \text{pcf}_{\kappa\text{-complete}}(\{\theta_\zeta : \zeta \in E\})$ and $\langle \theta_\zeta : \zeta \in E \rangle$ is strictly increasing and $\max \text{pcf}\{\theta_\zeta : \zeta \in E \cap \xi\} \leq \theta_\xi$ for $\xi \in E$, by [Sh:g, Ch.VIII,1.5(2),(3),p.317].

Now $\max \text{pcf}\{\theta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in \zeta \cap E\} \leq \max \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{c}_\zeta) \leq \lambda$ so $\mu < \tau^* \leq$ the cardinal from clause (i) of 2.3, against an assumption. So we have carried the inductive step in defining N_n^0, N_n^1 .

So N_n^0, N_n^1 are well defined for every n , clearly $\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n^0 \cap \lambda = \bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n^1 \cap \lambda$ (see [Sh:g, Ch.IX,3.3A,p.379]) hence $\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n^0 \cap T = \bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n^1 \cap T$, hence for some n , $N_n^0 \cap \{\eta \restriction \zeta : \zeta < \kappa\}$ has cardinality κ . Now

$$A = \{\nu \in T : \text{for some } \rho \text{ we have } \nu \triangleleft \rho \in N_n^0\}$$

belongs to $\mathfrak{B}_{n+1} \cap [T]^\kappa$ and $\{\eta \restriction \zeta : \zeta < \kappa\} \subseteq A$.

Contradiction to the choice of η .

Second inequality Cardinal of (ii) $\leq$ cardinal of (i).

By the proof of [Sh:g, II,3.5]. $\square_{2.3}$

2.4 Definition. 1) Assume $I \subseteq J \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$, I an ideal on κ , J an ideal or the complement of a filter on κ , e.g. $J = \mathcal{P}^-(\kappa) = \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \setminus \{\kappa\}$ stipulating $f \neq_J g \Leftrightarrow \{i < \kappa : f(i) = g(i)\} \in J$. We let

$$T_{I,J}^+(f, \lambda) = \sup\{|F|^+ : F \in \mathcal{F}_{I,J}(f, \lambda)\}$$

and

$$T_{I,J}(f, \lambda) = \sup\{|F| : F \in \mathcal{F}_{I,J}(f, \lambda)\}$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{I,J}(f, \lambda) = \{F : F \subseteq \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i) \text{ and } f \neq g \in F \Rightarrow f \neq_J g$$

$$\text{and } A \in I \Rightarrow \lambda \geq |\{f \restriction A : f \in F\}|\}.$$

2) For J an ideal on κ , $\theta \geq \kappa$ and $f \in {}^\kappa(\text{Ord} \setminus \{0\})$, we let

$$\mathbf{U}_J(f, \theta) = \text{Min}\{|\mathcal{P}| : \mathcal{P} \subseteq [\sup \text{Rang}(f)]^\theta \text{ and for every } g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)$$

$$\text{for some } a \in \mathcal{P} \text{ we have } \{i < \kappa : g(i) \in a\} \in J^+\}.$$

If $\theta = \kappa$ ($= \text{Dom}(J)$), then we may omit θ . If f is constantly λ we may write λ instead of f .

3) For $I \subseteq J$, I ideal on κ , J an ideal or compliment of a filter on κ , $\mu \geq \theta \geq \kappa$ and $f \in {}^\kappa(\text{Ord} \setminus \{0\})$ let

$$\mathbf{U}_{I,J}(f, \theta, \mu) = \sup\{\mathbf{U}_J(F, \theta) : F \in \mathcal{F}_I^-(f, \mu)\}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_I^-(f, \mu) = \{ & F : F \subseteq \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i) \text{ and} \\ & A \in I \Rightarrow \mu \geq |\{f \restriction A : f \in F\}| \} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}_J(F, \theta) = \text{Min}\{ & |\mathcal{P}| : \mathcal{P} \subseteq [\sup \text{Rang}(f)]^\theta \text{ and for every } f \in F \\ & \text{for some } a \in \mathcal{P} \text{ we have } \{i < \kappa : f(i) \in a\} \in J^+\}. \end{aligned}$$

2.5 *Fact.* Let $\lambda \geq \kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) > \aleph_0$.

- 1) $\lambda^{\kappa, \text{tr}} = T_{J_\kappa^{bd}, \mathcal{P}^-(\kappa)}(\lambda, \lambda)$ and $\lambda^{\langle \kappa, \theta \rangle} \leq \mathbf{U}_{J_\kappa^{bd}}(\lambda, \theta)$.
- 2) If $\lambda \geq \mu$, then $\lambda^{\kappa, \text{tr}} \geq \mu^{\kappa, \text{tr}}$ and $\lambda^{<\kappa>} \geq \mu^{<\kappa>}$.
- 3) $\lambda^{\kappa, \text{tr}} = \lambda^{\langle \kappa \rangle} + \kappa^{\kappa, \text{tr}}$.
- 4) Assume $I \subseteq J$ are ideals on κ . Then $T_I^+(f, \lambda) > \mu$ if:

- (i) each $f(i)$ is a regular cardinal $\lambda_i \in (\kappa, \lambda)$
- (ii) $\prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)/J$ is μ -directed
- (iii) for some $A_\zeta \subseteq \kappa$ for $\zeta < \zeta^* < \text{Min}f(j)$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \text{pcf}\{f(i) : i \in A_\zeta\} \leq \lambda \text{ (hence } \text{cf}\left(\prod_{i \in A_\zeta} f(i)\right) \leq \lambda) \text{ and } \{A_\zeta : \zeta < \zeta^*\} \\ \text{generates an ideal on } \kappa \text{ extending } I \text{ but included in } J. \end{aligned}$$

5) $\mathbf{U}_J(\lambda) \leq \mathbf{U}_J(\lambda, \theta) \leq \mathbf{U}_J(\lambda) + \text{cf}([\theta]^\kappa, \subseteq) \leq \mathbf{U}_J(\lambda) + \theta^\kappa$ and $T_I(f) \leq \mathbf{U}_I(f) + 2^\kappa$ and $\mathbf{U}_{I,J}(f, \lambda) \leq T_{I,J}(f, \lambda) \leq \mathbf{U}_{I,J}(f, \lambda) + 2^\kappa$ where $I \subseteq J$ are ideals on κ . Also obvious monotonicity properties (in I, J, λ, θ, f) holds.

Proof. 1) Easy. Let us prove the first equation. First assume $F \in \mathcal{F}_{J_\kappa^{bd}, \mathcal{P}^-(\kappa)}(\lambda, \lambda)$, and we define a tree as follows: for $i < \kappa$ the i th level is

$$T_i = \{f \restriction i : f \in F\}$$

and

$$T = \bigcup_{i < \kappa} T_i, \text{ with the natural order } \subseteq.$$

Clearly T is a tree with κ levels, the i -th level being T_i .

By the definition of $\mathcal{F}_{J_\kappa^{bd}, \mathcal{P}^-(\kappa)}(\lambda, \lambda)$ as $i < \kappa \Rightarrow \{j : j < i\} \in J_\kappa^{bd}$, clearly $|T_i| \leq \lambda$.

Now for each $f \in F$, clearly $t_f =: \langle (f \restriction i) : i < \kappa \rangle$ is a κ -branch of T , and $f_1 \neq f_2 \in F \Rightarrow t_{f_1} \neq t_{f_2}$ so T has at least $|F|$ κ -branches.

The other direction is easy, too. Note that the proof gives $=^+$; i.e., the supremum is obtained in one side iff it is obtained in the other side.

2) If T is a tree with μ nodes and κ levels then we can add λ nodes adding λ branches. Also the other inequality is trivial.

3) First $\lambda^{\kappa, \text{tr}} \geq \lambda^{<\kappa>}$ because if T is a tree with λ nodes and κ levels, then we know $|\lim_\kappa(T)| \leq \lambda^{\kappa, \text{tr}}$, hence $\mathcal{P} = \{t : t \text{ is a } \kappa\text{-branch of } T\}$ has cardinality $\leq \lambda^{\kappa, \text{tr}}$ and satisfies the requirement in the definition of $\lambda^{<\kappa>}$.

Second $\lambda^{\kappa, \text{tr}} \geq \kappa^{\kappa, \text{tr}}$ by part (2) of 2.5.

Lastly, $\lambda^{\kappa, \text{tr}} \leq \lambda^{<\kappa>} + \kappa^{\kappa, \text{tr}}$ because if T is a tree with λ nodes and κ levels, we know by Definition 2.1 that there is $\mathcal{P} \subseteq [T]^\kappa$ of cardinality $\leq \lambda^{<\kappa>}$ such that every κ -branch of T is included in some $A \in \mathcal{P}$, without loss of generality $x <_T y \in A \in \mathcal{P} \Rightarrow x \in A$; so

$$\begin{aligned} |\lim_\kappa(T)| &= |\{t : t \text{ a } \kappa\text{-branch of } T\}| \\ &= \left| \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{P}} \{t \subseteq A : t \text{ a } \kappa\text{-branch of } T\} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} |\lim_\kappa(T \restriction A)| \\ &\leq |\mathcal{P}| + \kappa^{\kappa, \text{tr}} \leq \lambda^{<\kappa>} + \kappa^{\kappa, \text{tr}}. \end{aligned}$$

4) Like the proof of [Sh:g, Ch.II,3.5].

5) Left to the reader. □_{2.5}

2.6 Lemma. Assume

- (a) $I \subseteq J$ are ideals on κ
- (b) I is generated by $\leq \mu^*$ sets, $\mu^* \geq \kappa$
- (c) $T_{I,J}^+(f, \lambda) > \mu = \text{cf}(\mu) > \mu^* \geq T_{I,J}(\mu^*, \kappa)$
- (d) κ is not the union of countably many members of I .

Then We can find $A_0 \subseteq A_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq A_n \subseteq \dots$ from I^+ with union κ , such that for each n there is $\langle \lambda_i^n : i \in A_n \rangle, \mu^* < \lambda_i^n = \text{cf}(\lambda_i^n) \leq f(i)$ such that:

$$\prod_{i \in A_n} \lambda_i^n / J \text{ is } \mu\text{-directed}$$

$$A \subseteq A_n, A \in I \Rightarrow \text{cf}\left(\prod_{i \in A} \lambda_i^n\right) \leq \lambda.$$

2.7 Remark. The point in the proof is that if I is generated by $\{B_\gamma : \gamma < \gamma^* \leq \mu^*\}$, and $\{\eta_\alpha : \alpha < \mu^+\}$ are distinct branches and $f \in {}^A(\lambda + 1 \setminus \{0\})$, $A \subseteq \kappa$ and $i \in A \Rightarrow \text{cf}(f(i)) > \mu^*$, then for some $g < f$ for every $\gamma < \gamma^*$ and $\alpha < \mu^+$, $\{i < \gamma : \text{if } \eta_\alpha(i) < f(i) \text{ then } \eta_\alpha(i) < g(i)\} = \gamma \bmod J_{<\lambda^+}(f \restriction \gamma)$.

Proof. Similar to the proof of 1.1 adding the main point of the proof of 2.3, the “fact” there.

We can further generalize

2.8 Definition. For $I \subseteq J \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$, function $f^* \in {}^\kappa\text{Reg}$ and λ , we let

$$\mathcal{F}_{(I,J,\lambda)}^1(f^*) = \left\{ F \subseteq \prod_{i < \kappa} f^*(i) : \text{if } A \in J \text{ then} \right. \\ \left. \lambda \geq |\{(f \restriction A)/I : f \in F\}| \right\}$$

(so I is without loss of generality an ideal on κ and this is just $\mathcal{F}_I^-(f^*, \lambda)$)

$$\mathcal{F}_{(I,J,\lambda)}^2(f^*) = \left\{ F \subseteq \prod_{i < \kappa} f^*(i) : \text{if } A \in J, \text{ and } f, g \in F \text{ are distinct} \right. \\ \left. \text{then } \{i \in A : f(i) = g(i)\} \in I \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{(I,J,\lambda,\bar{\theta})}^3(f^*) = \left\{ F \subseteq \prod_{i < \kappa} f^*(i) : \text{if } A \in J, \text{ then for some} \right. \\ \left. G \subseteq \prod_{i \in A} [f^*(i)]^{\theta_i} \text{ of cardinality } \leq \lambda \text{ we have} \right. \\ \left. (\forall f \in F)(\exists g \in G)\{i \in A : f(i) \notin g(i)\} \in I \right\}.$$

If Ξ is a set of such tuples $\mathcal{F}_\Xi^\ell(f^*) = \bigcap_{\Upsilon \in \Xi} \mathcal{F}_\Upsilon^\ell(f^*)$

If in all the tuples λ is the third element, we write triples and f, λ instead of f .

For any $\mathcal{F}_\Upsilon^\ell$ we let $T_\Upsilon^\ell(f^*) = \sup\{|F| : F \in \mathcal{F}_\Upsilon^\ell(f^*)\}$ but: instead of T we have $F \in \mathcal{F}_I(f)$ exemplifying $\mathbf{U}_{I,J}(f, \lambda) > \mu$; i.e. $\mathbf{U}_{I,J}(F, \lambda) > \mu$. Then $\eta \in F$ satisfies $(\forall A \in \mathcal{P})[\{i : \eta(i) \in A\} \in J]$. We choose N_n^0, N_n^1 satisfying (a)-(f) with $\gamma_n = 1$.

§3 ON THE DEPTH BEHAVIOUR FOR ULTRAPRODUCTS

The problem originates from Monk [M] and see on it Roslanowski Shelah [RoSh 534] and then [Sh 506, §3] but the presentation is self-contained. We would like to have (letting B_i denote Boolean algebra), for D an ultrafilter on κ :

$$\text{Depth}(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i / D) \geq \left| \prod_{i < \kappa} \text{Depth}(B_i / D) \right|.$$

(If D is just a filter, we should use T_D instead of product in the right side). Because of the problem of attainment (serious by Magidor Shelah [MgSh 433]), we rephrase the question:

⊗ for D an ultrafilter on κ , does $\lambda_i < \text{Depth}^+(B_i)$ for $i < \kappa$ imply

$$\left| \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i / D \right| < \text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i / D)$$

at least when $\lambda_i > 2^\kappa$;

⊗' for D a filter on κ does $\lambda_i < \text{Depth}^+(B_i)$ for $i < \kappa$ imply (assuming $\lambda_i > 2^\kappa$ for simplicity):

$$\begin{aligned} \mu = \text{cf}(\mu) < T_{D+A}^+(\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle) \text{ for some } A \in D^+ \Rightarrow \\ \mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i / (D + A)) \text{ for some } A \in D^+. \end{aligned}$$

As found in [Sh 506], this actually is connected to a pcf problem, whose answer under reasonable restrictions is 1.6. So now we can clarify the connections.

Also, by changing the invariant (closing under homomorphisms, see [M]) we get a nicer result; this shall be dealt with here.

The results here (mainly 3.5) supercede [Sh 506, 3.26].

3.1 Definition. 1) For a partial order P (e.g. a Boolean algebra) let

$\text{Depth}^+(P) = \min\{\lambda : \text{we cannot find } a_\alpha \in P \text{ for } \alpha < \lambda \text{ such that}$

$$\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow a_\alpha <_P a_\beta\}.$$

2) For a Boolean algebra B let

$$D_h^+(B) = \text{Depth}_h^+(B) = \sup\{\text{Depth}^+(B') : B' \text{ is a homomorphic image of } B\}.$$

3) $\text{Depth}(P) = \sup\{\mu : \text{there are } a_\alpha \in P \text{ for } \alpha < \mu \text{ such that}$

$$\alpha < \beta < \mu \Rightarrow a_\alpha <_P a_\beta\}.$$

4) $\text{Depth}_h(P) = D_h(P) = \sup\{\text{Depth}(B') : B' \text{ is a homomorphic image of } B\}.$

5) We write D_r or Dh_r or Depth_r if we restrict ourselves to regular cardinals. Of course we could have looked at the ordinals.

3.2 Definition. 1) For a linear order $\mathcal{J}$, let the interval Boolean algebra, $BA[\mathcal{J}]$ be the Boolean algebra of subsets of $\mathcal{J}$ generated by $\{[s, t)_{\mathcal{J}} : s < t \text{ are from } \{-\infty\} \cup \mathcal{J} \cup \{+\infty\}\}$.
 2) For a Boolean algebra B and regular θ , let $\text{com}_{<\theta}(B)$ be the $(<\theta)$ -completion of B , that is the closure of B under the operations $-x$ and $\bigvee_{i<\alpha} x_i$ for $\alpha < \theta$ inside the completion of B .

3.3 Fact. 1) If B is the interval Boolean algebra of the ordinal $\gamma \geq \omega$ then

- (a) $D_h^+(B) = |\gamma|^+$
- (b) $\text{Depth}^+(B) = |\gamma|^+$.

2) If B' is a subalgebra of a homomorphic image of B , then $D_h^+(B) \geq D_h^+(B')$.
 3) If $D' \supseteq D$ are filters on κ and for $i < \kappa$, B'_i is a subalgebra of a homomorphic image of B_i then:

- (α) $\prod_{i<\kappa} B'_i/D'$ is a subalgebra of a homomorphic image of $\prod_{i<\kappa} B_i/D$, hence
- (β) $D_h^+(\prod_{i<\kappa} B_i/D) \geq D_h^+(\prod_{i<\kappa} B'_i/D')$.

4) In parts (2), (3) we can replace D_h by D if we omit “homomorphic image”.

Proof. Straightforward.

3.4 Claim. 1) If D is a filter on κ and for $i < \kappa$, B_i a Boolean algebra, $\lambda_i < \text{Depth}_h^+(B_i)$ then

- (a) $\text{Depth}_h^+(\prod_{i<\kappa} B_i/D) \geq \sup_{D_1 \supseteq D} \left(\text{tcf}(\prod_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i/D_1) \right)^+$
(i.e. sup on the cases tcf is well defined)
- (b) $\text{Depth}_h^+(\prod_{i<\kappa} B_i/D)$ is $\geq \text{Depth}_h^+(\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/D)$ and is at least $\sup\{[\text{tcf}(\prod_{i<\kappa} \lambda'_i/D_1)]^+ : \lambda'_i < \text{Depth}^+(B_i), D_1 \supseteq D\}$.

2) $\mu < \text{Depth}_h^+(B)$ iff for some $a_i \in B$ for $i < \mu$ we have that: $\alpha < \beta < \mu, n < \omega$, and $\alpha_\ell < \beta_\ell < \mu$ for $\ell < n$ together imply that $B \models “(a_\beta - a_\alpha) - \bigcup_{\ell < n} (a_{\alpha_\ell} - a_{\beta_\ell}) > 0”$.

3) Let $A \in D^+$ (D a filter on κ). In $\prod_{i<\kappa} B_i/D$ there is a chain of order type Υ if in $\prod_{i<\kappa} B_i/(D + A)$ there is such a chain. If $\Upsilon = \lambda$; $\text{cf}(\lambda) > 2^k$ appa also the inverse is true.

4) If $\mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i<\kappa} B_i/D)$ and $\text{cf}(\mu) > 2^\kappa$, then we can find $A \in D^+$ and

$f_\alpha \in \prod_{i < \kappa} B_i$ for $\alpha < \mu$ such that letting $D^* = D + A$:

$\alpha < \beta < \mu \Rightarrow (\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i / D^*) \models f_\alpha / D^* < f_\beta / D^*$ moreover $f_\alpha <_{D^*} f_\beta$.

5) Like (1) replacing Depth_h^+ by Depth^+ , $D_1 \supseteq D$ by $\{D + A : A \in D^+\}$.

Proof. Check, e.g.:

2) The “if” direction:

Let I be the ideal of B generated by $\{a_\alpha - a_\beta : \alpha < \beta < \mu\}$, $h : B \rightarrow B/I$ the canonical homomorphism, so $\langle a_\alpha / I : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ is strictly increasing in B/I .

The “only if” direction:

Let h be a homomorphism from B onto B_1 and $\langle b_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ be a (strictly) increasing sequence of elements of B_1 . Choose $a_\alpha \in B$ such that $h(a_\alpha) = b_\alpha$, so $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow a_\alpha \setminus a_\beta \in \text{Ker}(h)$ but $a_\alpha \notin \text{Ker}$.

3) The first implication is trivial, the second follows from part (4).

4) First, assume μ is regular. Let $\langle f_\alpha / D : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ exemplify $\mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i / D)$.

Then $\alpha < \beta < \mu \Rightarrow f_\alpha \leq_D f_\beta$ & $\neg(f_\alpha =_D f_\beta)$, so for each $\alpha \langle \{i < \kappa : f_\alpha(i) = f_\beta(i)\} / D : \beta < \mu \rangle$ is decreasing and $|2^\kappa / D| < \mu = \text{cf}(\mu)$ hence for some $\beta_\alpha \in (\alpha, \mu)$ we have $(\forall \beta)(\beta_\alpha \leq \beta < \mu \Rightarrow \{i < \kappa : f_\alpha(i) \neq f_{\beta_\alpha}(i)\} = \{i < \kappa : f_\alpha(i) \neq f_\beta(i)\} \text{ mod } D$ (as f_γ / D is increasing). So $\langle \{i : f_\alpha(i) = f_{\beta_\alpha}(i)\} / D : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ is decreasing and $|2^\kappa / D| \leq 2^\kappa < \mu$, hence for some $A^* \subseteq \kappa$ the set $E = \{\alpha < \mu : \{i < \kappa : f_\alpha(i) < f_{\beta_\alpha}(i)\} = A^* \text{ mod } D\}$ is unbounded and even stationary in μ . Let $D^* = D + A^*$, so for $\alpha < \beta < \mu$ we have $f_\alpha \leq_D f_\beta$ hence $f_\alpha \leq_{D^*} f_\beta$, but $\alpha \in E$ & $\beta \geq \beta_\alpha \Rightarrow f_\alpha \neq_{D^*} f_\beta$. Hence there is $E' \subseteq \{\delta \in E : (\forall \alpha < \delta \cap E)(\beta_\alpha < \delta)\}$ is unbounded in μ and clearly $(\forall \alpha, \beta)(\alpha < \beta \text{ \& } \alpha \in E' \text{ \& } \beta \in E' \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_{D^*} f_\beta)$.

So $\{f_\alpha : \alpha \in E'\}$ exemplifies the conclusion.

Second, if μ is singular, let $\mu = \sum_{\zeta < \text{cf}(\mu)} \mu_\zeta$, $\mu_\zeta > 2^\kappa$; μ_ζ strictly increasing and each

μ_ζ is regular. So given $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$, for each $\zeta < \text{cf}(\mu)$ we can find $E_\zeta \subseteq \mu_\zeta^+$ of cardinality μ_ζ^+ and $A_\zeta \in D^+$ such that $\alpha \in E_\zeta$ & $\beta \in E_\zeta$ & $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_{D+A_\zeta} f_\beta$. For some A , $\text{cf}(\mu) = \sup\{\zeta : A_\zeta = A\}$; so A and the f_α 's for $\alpha \cup \{E_\zeta \setminus \{\text{Min}(E_\zeta)\} : \zeta < \text{cf}(\mu)\}$ is such that $A_\zeta = A$ are as required. $\square_{3.4}$

We now give lower bound of depth of reduced products of Boolean algebras B_i from the depths of the B_i 's.

3.5 First Main Lemma. *Let D be a filter on κ and $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ a sequence of cardinals $(> 2^\kappa)$ and $2^\kappa < \mu = \text{cf}(\mu)$. Then:*

1) $(\alpha) \Leftrightarrow (\alpha)^+ \Leftrightarrow (\beta) \Leftrightarrow (\beta)^- \Leftrightarrow (\gamma)^+ \Rightarrow (\gamma) \Rightarrow (\delta)$.

2) If in addition $(\forall \sigma < \mu)(\sigma^{\aleph_0} < \mu) \vee (D \text{ is } \aleph_1\text{-complete})$ we also have $(\gamma) \Leftrightarrow (\gamma)^+ \Leftrightarrow (\delta)$ so all clauses are equivalent

where:

(α) if B_i is a Boolean algebra, $\lambda_i \leq \text{Depth}^+(B_i)$ then $\mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i / D)$

- (β) there are cardinals $\gamma_i < \lambda_i$ for $i < \kappa$ such that, letting B_i be $BA[\gamma_i]$ = the interval Boolean algebra of (the linear order) γ_i , we have $\mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i/D)$
- (γ) there are $\langle \langle \lambda_{i,n} : n < n_i \rangle : i < \kappa \rangle$ where $\lambda_{i,n} = \text{cf}(\lambda_{i,n}) < \lambda_i$ and a non-trivial filter D^* on $\bigcup_{i < \kappa} (\{i\} \times n_i)$ such that:
- (i) $\mu = \text{tcf}(\prod_{(i,n)} \lambda_{i,n}/D^*)$
 - (ii) for some $A^* \in D^+$ we have $D + A^* = \{A \subseteq \kappa : \text{the set } \bigcup_{i \in A} (\{i\} \times n_i) \text{ belongs to } D^*\}$
- (δ) for some filter $D' = D + A, A \in D^+$ and cardinals $\lambda'_i < \lambda_i$ we have $\mu \leq T_{D'}(\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle)$
- (β)' like (β) we allow γ_i to be an ordinal
- (β)⁻ letting B_i be the disjoint sum of $\{BA[\gamma] : \gamma < \lambda_i\}$ we have: $\mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i/D)$.
- (γ)⁺ for some filter D^* of the form $D + A$ and $\lambda'_i = \text{cf}(\lambda'_i) < \lambda_i$ we have $\mu = \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda'_i/D^*)$
- (α)⁺ if B_i is a Boolean algebra, $\lambda_i \leq \text{Depth}^+(B_i)$ then for some $A \in D^+$ we have, setting $D^* = D + A$, that $\mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i, <_{D^*})$; moreover for some $f_\alpha \in \prod_{i < \kappa} B_i$ for $\alpha < \mu$ we have $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow \{i : B_i \models f_\alpha(i) < f_\beta(i)\} = \kappa \bmod D^*$.

Proof. 1) We shall prove $(\alpha) \Leftrightarrow (\beta)(\beta)' \Rightarrow (\beta)^- \Rightarrow (\gamma)^+ \Rightarrow (\beta)$ and $(\alpha)^+ \Leftrightarrow (\alpha)$ and $(\gamma)^+ \Rightarrow (\gamma) \Rightarrow (\delta)$.

This suffices.

Now for $(\alpha)^+ \Rightarrow (\alpha)$ note that if $(\lambda_i, B_i$ for $i < \kappa$ are given and) $A \in D^+$, $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ exemplify $(\alpha)^+$ then letting $f'_\alpha = (f_\alpha \upharpoonright A) \cup 0_{(\kappa \setminus A)}$; i.e. $f'_\alpha(i)$ is $f_\alpha(i)$ when $i \in A$ and 0_{B_i} if $i \in \kappa \setminus A$, easily $\langle f'_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ exemplify (α) . Next $(\alpha) \Rightarrow (\alpha)^+$ by 3.4(4).

Now $(\beta) \Rightarrow (\beta)' \Rightarrow (\beta)^-$ holds trivially and for $(\beta)' \Rightarrow (\gamma)^+$ repeat the proof of [Sh 506, 3.24,p.35] or the relevant part of the proof of 3.6 below (with appropriate changes). Also $(\beta)^- \Rightarrow (\beta)'$ as in the proof of 3.6 below. Easily $(\gamma)^+ \Rightarrow (\beta)$; also $(\beta) \Rightarrow (\alpha)$ because

- (i) if γ_i a cardinal $< \text{Depth}^+(B_i)$, the Boolean Algebra $BA[\gamma_i]$ can be embedded into B_i , and
- (ii) if B'_i is embeddable into B_i for $i < \kappa$ then $B' = \prod_{i < \kappa} B'_i/D$ can be embedded into $\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i/D$

(iii) if B' is embeddable into B then $\text{Depth}^+(B') \leq \text{Depth}^+(B)$.

Now $(\alpha) \Rightarrow (\beta)$ trivially. Also $(\gamma)^+ \Rightarrow (\gamma) \Rightarrow (\delta)$ trivially. Next we note $(\beta) \Rightarrow (\delta)$, as if $B_i = BA[\gamma_i]$ and $\gamma_i < \lambda_i$ and $\mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod B_i/D)$, then by 3.4(4) there is a sequence $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ satisfying $f_\alpha \in \prod_{i < \kappa} B_i$ and $A^* \in D^+$ such that $\alpha < \beta <$

$\mu \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_{D+A} f_\beta$. So $\{f_\alpha : \alpha < \mu\}$ exemplifies that $T_{D+A}(\langle |B_i| : i < \kappa \rangle) \geq \mu$, as required in clause (δ) .

2) Assume $(\forall \sigma < \mu)(\sigma^{\aleph_0} < \mu) \vee (D \text{ is } \aleph_1\text{-complete})$.

Now 1.6 gives $(\gamma) \Leftrightarrow (\gamma)^+ \Leftrightarrow (\delta)$. $\square_{3.5}$

Now we turn to the other variant, D_h^+ .

3.6 Second Main Lemma. *Let D be a filter on κ and $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ be a sequence of cardinals $(> 2^\kappa)$ and $2^\kappa < \mu = \text{cf}(\mu)$. Then (see below on $(\alpha), \dots$):*

1) $(\alpha) \Leftrightarrow (\alpha)^+ \Leftrightarrow (\beta) \Leftrightarrow (\beta)^- \Leftrightarrow (\gamma)$ and $(\gamma)^+ \Rightarrow (\gamma) \Leftrightarrow (\beta) \Rightarrow (\delta)$.

2) If $(\forall \sigma < \mu)(\sigma^{\aleph_0} < \mu) \vee (D \text{ is } \aleph_1\text{-complete})$ we also have $(\beta) \Leftrightarrow (\gamma) \Leftrightarrow (\gamma)^+ \Leftrightarrow (\delta)$ (so all clauses are equivalent)

where:

(α) if B_i is a Boolean algebra, $\lambda_i \leq \text{Depth}_h^+(B_i)$ then $\mu < \text{Depth}_h^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i/D)$

(β) there are cardinals $\gamma_i < \lambda_i$ for $i < \kappa$ such that, letting B_i be $BA[\gamma_i]$ = the interval Boolean algebra of (the linear order) γ_i , we have $\mu < \text{Depth}_h^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i/D)$

(γ) there are $\langle \langle \lambda_{i,n} : n < n_i \rangle : i < \kappa \rangle$ where $\lambda_{i,n} = \text{cf}(\lambda_{i,n}) < \lambda_i$ and a non-trivial filter D^* on $\bigcup_{i < \kappa} \{i\} \times n_i$ such that:

$\mu = \text{tcf}(\prod_{(i,n)} \lambda_{i,n}/D^*)$ and $D \subseteq \{A \subseteq \kappa : \text{the set } \bigcup_{i \in A} \{i\} \times n_i \text{ belongs to } D^*\}$

(δ) for some filter $D^* \supseteq D$ and cardinals $\lambda'_i < \lambda_i$ we have $\mu \leq T_{D^*}(\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle)$

$(\beta)'$ like (β) but allowing γ_i to be any ordinal $< \lambda_i$

$(\beta)^-$ letting B_i be the disjoint sum of $\{BA[\gamma] : \gamma < \lambda_i\}$ (so $\text{Depth}^+(B_i) = \lambda_i$) we have:

$\mu < \text{Depth}_h^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i/D)$

$(\gamma)^+$ there are $\lambda'_i = \text{cf}(\lambda'_i) \in (2^\kappa, \lambda_i)$ for $i < \kappa$ and filter $D_1^* \supseteq D$ such that $\prod_{i \in A} \lambda'_i/D^*$ has true cofinality μ

$(\alpha)^+$ if B_i is a Boolean algebra, $\lambda_i \leq \text{Depth}_h^+(B_i)$ then for some filter $D^* \supseteq D$ we have $\mu < \text{Depth}_h^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i/D^*)$.

Proof. Now $(\beta) \Rightarrow (\beta)'$ trivially and $(\beta)' \Rightarrow (\beta)^-$ by 3.3(3) as $BA[\gamma_i]$ can be embedded into B_i , and similarly $(\beta) \Rightarrow (\alpha)$ by 3.3(3), and $(\alpha) \Rightarrow (\beta)$ trivially. Also $(\alpha) \Rightarrow (\alpha)^+$ trivially and $(\alpha)^+ \Rightarrow (\alpha)$ easily (e.g. by 3.3(3)).

Also $(\gamma)^+ \Rightarrow (\beta)$ trivially and $(\gamma)^+ \Rightarrow (\gamma)$ trivially.

We shall prove below $(\gamma) \Rightarrow (\beta)'$, $(\beta) \Rightarrow (\gamma)$ and $(\beta)^- \Rightarrow (\beta)'$.

Together we have $(\alpha) \Rightarrow (\alpha)^+ \Rightarrow (\alpha) \Rightarrow (\beta) \Rightarrow (\beta)' \Rightarrow (\beta)^- \Rightarrow (\beta)' \Rightarrow (\gamma) \Rightarrow (\beta) \Rightarrow (\alpha)$ and $(\gamma)^+ \Rightarrow (\gamma) \Rightarrow (\delta)$; this is enough for part (1).

Lastly, to prove part (2) of 3.6, by part (1) it is enough to prove $(\delta) \Rightarrow (\gamma)^+$ as in the proof of 3.5.

$(\gamma) \Rightarrow (\beta)$

So we have $\lambda_{i,n}$ (for $n < n_i, i < \kappa$), D^* as in clause (γ) and let $\langle g_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$ be $<_{D^*}$ -increasing cofinal in $\prod_{(i,n)} \lambda_{i,n}$ but abusing notation we may write $g_\varepsilon(i, n)$ for

$g_\varepsilon((i, n))$. Let $\gamma_i =: \max\{\lambda_{i,n} : n < n_i\}$ and $B_i =: BA[\gamma_i]$, clearly $\gamma_i < \lambda_i$, a (regular) cardinal as by assumption $\lambda_{i,n} < \lambda_i \leq \text{Depth}^+(B_i)$. In B_i we have a strictly increasing sequence of length γ_i . Without loss of generality $\{\lambda_{i,n} : n < n_i\}$ is with no repetition (see [Sh:g, I.1.3(8)]) and $\lambda_{i,0} > \lambda_{i,1} > \dots > \lambda_{i,n_i-1}$.

So for each i we can find $a_{i,n} \in B_i$ (for $n < n_i$) pairwise disjoint and $\langle a_{i,n,\zeta} : \zeta < \lambda_{i,n} \rangle$ (again in B_i) strictly increasing and $< a_{i,n}$.

Let $b_{i,\varepsilon} \in B_i$ be $\bigcup_{n < n_i} a_{i,n,g_\varepsilon(i,n)}$ (it is a finite union of members of B_i hence a

member of B_i). Let $b_\varepsilon \in \prod_{i < \kappa} B_i/D$ be $b_\varepsilon = \langle b_{i,\varepsilon} : i < \kappa \rangle/D$. Let J be the ideal of

$B =: \prod_{i < \kappa} B_i/D$ generated by $\{b_\varepsilon - b_\zeta : \varepsilon < \zeta < \mu\}$. Clearly $\varepsilon < \zeta < \mu \Rightarrow b_\varepsilon \leq b_\zeta \text{ mod } J$, so by 3.4(2) what we have to prove is: assuming $\varepsilon < \zeta < \mu, k < \omega$ and $\varepsilon_m < \zeta_m < \mu$ for $m < k$, then $B \models "b_\zeta - b_\varepsilon - \bigcup_{m < k} (b_{\varepsilon_m} - b_{\zeta_m}) \neq 0"$.

Now

$$Y =: \left\{ (i, n) : g_\varepsilon(i, n) < g_\zeta(i, n) \text{ and } g_{\varepsilon_m}(i, n) < g_{\zeta_m}(i, n) \text{ for } m = 0, 1, \dots, k-1 \right\}$$

is known to belong to D^* , hence it is not empty so let $(i^*, n^*) \in Y$. Now

$B_{i^*} \models b_{i^*,\xi} \cap a_{i^*,n^*} = a_{i^*,n^*,g_\xi(i^*,n^*)}$, for every $\xi < \mu$, in particular for ξ among $\varepsilon, \zeta, \varepsilon_m, \zeta_m$ (for $m < k$). As $(i^*, n^*) \in Y$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{i^*} \models (b_\zeta - b_\varepsilon) \cap a_{i^*,n^*} &\geq b_\zeta \cap a_{i^*,n^*} - b_\varepsilon \cap a_{i^*,n^*} \\ &= a_{i^*,n^*,g_\zeta(i^*,n^*)} - a_{i^*,n^*,g_\varepsilon(i^*,n^*)} > 0 \end{aligned}$$

(as $g_\zeta(i^*, n^*) > g_\varepsilon(i^*, n^*)$ as $(i^*, n^*) \in Y$) and similarly

$$B_{i^*} \models (b_{\varepsilon_m} - b_{\zeta_m}) \cap a_{i^*,n^*} = 0.$$

Hence

$$B_{i^*} \models "b_{i^*,\zeta} - b_{i^*,\varepsilon} - \bigcup_{m < k} (b_{i^*,\varepsilon_m} - b_{i^*,\zeta_m}) \neq 0".$$

As this holds for every $(i^*, n^*) \in Y$ and $Y \in D^*$, by the assumptions on D^* we have

$$\{i^* < \kappa : B_{i^*} \models "b_{i^*,\zeta} - b_{i^*,\varepsilon} - \bigcup_{m < k} (b_{i^*,\varepsilon_m} - b_{i^*,\zeta_m}) \neq 0"\} \in D^+$$

hence in $B, b_\zeta - b_\varepsilon \notin J$ as required.

$(\beta)' \Rightarrow (\gamma)$

Let B_i be the interval Boolean algebra for γ_i , an ordinal $< \lambda_i$.

To prove clause (γ) we assume that our regular μ is $< \text{Depth}_h^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i/D)$, and

we have to find $n_i < \omega, \lambda_{i,n} < \lambda_i$ for $i < \kappa, n < n_i$ and D^* as in the conclusion of clause (γ) . So there are $f_\alpha \in \prod_{i < \kappa} B_i$ for $\alpha < \mu$ and an ideal J of the Boolean

algebra $B =: \prod_{i < \kappa} B_i/D$ such that $f_\alpha/D < f_\beta/D \text{ mod } J$ for $\alpha < \beta$.

Remember $\mu > 2^\kappa$. Let $f_\alpha(i) = \bigcup_{\ell < n(\alpha,i)} [j_{\alpha,i,2\ell}, j_{\alpha,i,2\ell+1})$ where $j_{\alpha,i,\ell} < j_{\alpha,i,\ell+1} \leq$

γ_i for $\ell < 2n(\alpha,i)$. As $\mu = \text{cf}(\mu) > 2^\kappa$, without loss of generality $n_{\alpha,i} = n_i$. By [Sh 430, 6.6D] (better see [Sh 513, 6.1] or [Sh 620, 7.0]) we can find $A \subseteq A^* =: \{(i, \ell) : i < \kappa, \ell < 2n_i\}$ and $\langle \gamma_{i,\ell}^* : i < \kappa, \ell < 2n_i \rangle$ such that $(i, \ell) \in A \Rightarrow \gamma_{i,\ell}^*$ is a limit ordinal of cofinality $> 2^\kappa$ and

(*) for every $f \in \prod_{(i,\ell) \in A} \gamma_{i,\ell}^*$ and $\alpha < \mu$ there is $\beta \in (\alpha, \mu)$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} (i, \ell) \in A^* \setminus A &\Rightarrow j_{\beta,i,\ell} = \gamma_{i,\ell}^* \\ (i, \ell) \in A &\Rightarrow f(i, \ell) < j_{\beta,i,\ell} < \gamma_{i,\ell}^* \end{aligned}$$

For $(i, \ell) \in A^*$ define $\beta_{i,\ell}^*$ by

$$\beta_{i,\ell}^* =: \sup\{\gamma_{i,m}^* : (i, m) \in A^* \text{ and } \gamma_{i,m}^* < \gamma_{i,\ell}^* \text{ and } m < 2n_i \text{ (actually } m < \ell \text{ suffice)}\}.$$

Now $\beta_{i,\ell}^* < \gamma_{i,\ell}^*$ as the supremum is on a finite set, and the case $0 = \beta_{i,\ell}^* = \gamma_{i,\ell}^*$ does not occur if $(i, \ell) \in A$. Let

$$Y = \left\{ \alpha < \mu : \begin{aligned} &\text{if } (i, \ell) \in A^* \setminus A \text{ then } j_{\alpha,i,\ell} = \gamma_{i,\ell}^* \\ &\text{and if } (i, \ell) \in A \text{ then } \beta_{i,\ell}^* < j_{\alpha,i,\ell} < \gamma_{i,\ell}^* \end{aligned} \right\}.$$

Clearly $\{f_\alpha : \alpha \in Y\}$ satisfy (*), so without loss of generality $Y = \mu$.

Clearly

(*)₁ $\langle \gamma_{i,\ell}^* : \ell < 2n_i \rangle$ is non-decreasing (for each i).

Let $u_i = \{\ell < 2n_i : (\forall m < \ell)[\gamma_{i,m}^* < \gamma_{i,\ell}^*]\}$.

For $i < \kappa$, $\ell < n_i$ define

$$b_{i,\ell} =: f_\alpha(i) \cap [\beta_{i,\ell}^*, \gamma_{i,\ell}^*) \in B_i.$$

Let $w_i =: \{\ell \in u_i : \text{for every (equivalently some) } \alpha < \mu \text{ we have}$

$$B_i \models "[\beta_{i,\ell}^*, \gamma_{i,\ell}^*) \cap f_\alpha(i) \text{ is } \neq 0 \text{ and } \neq [\beta_{i,\ell}^*, \gamma_{i,\ell}^*)"]\}.$$

So

$$(*)_2 \quad f_\alpha(i) \setminus \bigcup_{\ell \in w_i} b_{i,\ell} \text{ does not depend on } \alpha, \text{ call it } c_i (\in B_I).$$

Let for $\ell \in w_i$

$$u_{i,\ell} =: \left\{ n < n_i : [j_{\alpha,i,2n}, j_{\alpha,i,2n+1}) \text{ is not disjoint to } [\beta_{i,\ell}^*, \gamma_{i,\ell}^*) \right. \\ \left. \text{for some (equivalently every) } \alpha < \mu \right\}.$$

$$A_0 = \left\{ (i, \ell) : i < \kappa, \ell \in w_i \text{ and for some } n \in u_{i,\ell} \text{ we have, for some} \right. \\ \left. (\equiv \text{ every}) \alpha < \mu \text{ that } j_{\alpha,i,2n} \leq \beta_{i,\ell}^* < j_{\alpha,i,2n+1} < \gamma_{i,\ell}^* \right\}.$$

$$A_1 = \left\{ (i, \ell) : i < \kappa, \ell \in w_i \text{ and for some } n \in u_{i,\ell} \text{ we have, for some} \right. \\ \left. (\equiv \text{ every}) \alpha < \mu \text{ that } j_{\alpha,i,2n} < \gamma_{i,\ell}^* \leq j_{\alpha,i,2n+1} \right\}.$$

Let

$$b_i^0 =: \bigcup \left\{ [\beta_{i,\ell}^*, \gamma_{i,\ell}^*) : \ell \in w_i \text{ and } (i, \ell) \in A_0 \right\} \in B_i$$

$$b_i^1 =: \bigcup \left\{ [\beta_{i,\ell}^*, \gamma_{i,\ell}^*) : \ell \in w_i \text{ and } (i, \ell) \in A_1 \right\} \in B_i$$

$$c_i^1 = b_i^0 \cap b_i^1, c_i^2 = b_i^0 \cap (1 - b_i^1), c_i^3 = b_i^1 \cap (1 - b_i^0), c_i^4 = (1 - b_i^0) \cap (1 - b_i^1)$$

$$b_0 =: \langle b_i^0 : i < \kappa \rangle / D \in B$$

$$b_1 =: \langle b_i^1 : i < \kappa \rangle / D \in B$$

$$c_t = \langle c_i^t : i < \kappa \rangle / D \in B, c = \langle c_i : i < \kappa \rangle / D \in B.$$

Let $J_2 = \{b \in B : \langle (f_\alpha/D) \cap b : \alpha < \mu \rangle \text{ is eventually constant modulo } J, (\exists \alpha < \mu)(\forall \beta)[\alpha \leq \beta < \mu \rightarrow (f_\alpha/D) \cap b - (f_\beta/D) \cap b \in J]\}$. So $B \models c \leq f_\alpha/D$.

Clearly J_1 is an ideal of B extending J and $1_B \notin B$. Also if $x \in J_1^+$ then for some closed unbounded $E \subseteq \mu$ we have: $\langle (f_\alpha/D) \cap x : \alpha \in E \rangle$ is strictly increasing modulo J .

Hence by easy manipulations without loss of generality:

(*)₃(a) if $c = c_t$ and $c \in J_1^+$ then $\langle (f_\alpha/D) \cap c : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ is strictly increasing modulo J

(b) for at least one $t, c_t \in J_1^+$.

By (*) we can find $0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \mu$ such that:

(*)₄ if $i < \kappa, \ell < 2n_i, \bigwedge_{\alpha < \mu} \gamma_{i,\ell}^* > j_{\alpha,i,\ell}$ and $k < 2$ then
 $\sup\{j_{\alpha_k,i,\ell_1} : j_{\alpha_k,i,\ell_1} < \gamma_{i,\ell}^* \text{ and } \ell_1 < 2n_i\} < j_{\alpha_{k+1},i,\ell}$.

Now if in (*)₃, $c_4 \in J_1^+$ occurs then

$$\begin{aligned} B_i \models "f_{\alpha_0}(i) \cap f_{\alpha_1}(i) \cap c_i^4 = c_i &= \bigcup_{\ell \in w_i} (f_{\alpha_0}(i) \cap f_{\alpha_1}(i)) \cap [\beta_{i,\ell}^*, \gamma_{i,\ell}^*) \\ &= \bigcup_{\ell \in w_i} 0_{B_i} = 0_{B_i}" \end{aligned}$$

(as for each $\ell \in w_i$ the intersection is the intersection of two unions of intervals which are pairwise disjoint) whereas we know $(f_{\alpha_0}/D) \cap (f_{\alpha_1}/D) \cap c_i^4 - c_i =_J f_{\alpha_0}/D \cap c_4 - c \notin J$; contradiction.

Next if in (*)₃, $c_2 \in J_1^+$ holds then

$$\begin{aligned} B_i \models "(f_{\alpha_1}(i) \cap c_i^4 = c_i) - (f_{\alpha_0}(i) \cap c_i^4 - c_i) &= \bigcup_{\ell \in w_i} [f_{\alpha_1}(i) \cap [\beta_{i,\ell}^*, \gamma_{i,\ell}^*) - f_{\alpha_0}(i) \cap [\beta_{i,\ell}^*, \gamma_{i,j}^*)] \\ &= \bigcup_{\ell \in w_i} 0_{B_i} = 0_{B_i}" \end{aligned}$$

(as for each $\ell \in w_i$ the term is the difference of two unions of intervals but the first is included in the right most interval of the second) and we have a contradiction.

Now if in (*)₃, $c_1 \in J^+$ holds then

$$\begin{aligned} B_i \models "(f_{\alpha_2}(i) \cap c_i^1 - c_i) - (f_{\alpha_1}(i) \cap c_i^1 - c_i) &\cup (f_{\alpha_0}(i) \cap c_i^1 - c_i) \\ &= \bigcup_{\ell \in w_i} [(f_{\alpha_2}(i) - f_{\alpha_1}(i) \cup f_{\alpha_0}(i)) \cap [\beta_{i,\ell}^*, \gamma_{i,\ell}^*)] \\ &= \bigcup_{\ell \in w_i} 0_{B_i} = 0_{B_i}" \end{aligned}$$

and we get a similar contradiction.

So

(*)₅ in (*)₃, $c_2 \in J_1^+$.

Without loss of generality

- (*)₆ for $\alpha < \mu, i < \kappa$ and $\ell < 2n_i$ such that $(i, \ell) \in A$ we have
 $\sup\{j_{2\alpha, i, \ell_1} : \ell_1 < 2n_i \text{ and } j_{2\alpha, i, \ell_1} < \gamma_{i, \ell}^*\} < j_{2\alpha+1, i, \ell}$.

Now for every $\alpha < \mu$ define $f'_\alpha \in \prod_{i < \kappa} B_i$ by

$$f'_\alpha(i) = \bigcup_{\ell \in v_i} [\beta_{i, \ell}^*, \max\{j_{\alpha, i, 2n+1} : n \in u_{i, \ell}\}).$$

Clearly

$$B_i \models "f_{2\alpha}(i) \cap c_i^2 - c_i \leq f'_\alpha(i) \leq f_{2\alpha+1}(i) \cap c_i^2 - c_i".$$

Let $v_i = \{\ell \in w_i : (i, \ell) \in A_0, (i, \ell) \notin A_1\}$, so $c_i^2 = \cup\{[\beta_{i, \ell}^*, \gamma_{i, \ell}^*) : \ell \in v_i\}$. As $\ell \in v_i \Rightarrow (i, \ell) \in A_0$ necessarily

- (*)₇ if $\ell \in v_i$ then ℓ is odd and $j_{\alpha, i, \ell-1} = \beta_{i, \ell}^* < j_{\alpha, i, 2\ell+1} < \gamma_{i, \ell}^*$.

Let $Y^* =: \bigcup_{i < \kappa} (\{i\} \times v_i)$ and we shall define now a family D_0 of subsets of Y^* .

For $Y \subseteq Y^*$, and for $\alpha < \mu$ define $f_{\alpha, Y} \in \prod_{i < \kappa} B_i$ by

$$f_{\alpha, Y}(i) = \cup\{[j_{\alpha, i, 2\ell}, j_{\alpha, i, 2\ell+1}) : \ell \in v_i \text{ and } (i, \ell) \notin Y\}.$$

For $g \in G =: \prod_{(i, \ell) \in Y^*} [\beta_{i, \ell}^*, \gamma_{i, \ell}^*)$ define $f_g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} B_i$ by $f_g(i) = \bigcup_{\ell \in v_i} [\beta_{i, \ell}^*, g((i, \ell))$), now

- (*)₈ for every $\alpha < \mu$ for some $g = g_\alpha^* \in G$ we have $f'_\alpha = f_g$
 [why? by the previous analysis in particular (*)₇].

Let

$$D_0 = \{Y \subseteq Y^* : \text{for some } Z \in D \text{ we have } \bigcup_{i \in Z} (\{i\} \times v_i) \subseteq Y\};$$

it is a filter on Y^* .

- (*)₉ if $g_1, g_2 \in G$ then

$$(a) \quad g_1 \leq_{D_0} g_2 \Leftrightarrow B \models (f_{g_1}/D) \cap c_2 \leq (f_{g_2}/D) \cap c_2$$

$$(b) \quad g_1 <_{D_0} g_2 \Leftrightarrow B \models (f_{g_1}/D) \cap c_2 < (f_{g_2}/D) \cap c_2$$

- (*)₁₀ for every $g' \in G$ for some $\alpha(g') < \mu$ we have $g' < g_{\alpha(g')}^*$ (see (*)₈)
 [why? by (*)].

Now

$$\otimes \text{cf}\left(\prod_{(i,\ell) \in Y^*} \gamma_{i,\ell}^*/D_0\right) \geq \mu.$$

[why? if not, we can find $G^* \subseteq G = \prod_{(i,\ell) \in Y^*} [\beta_{i,\ell}^*, \gamma_{i,\ell}^*)$ of cardinality $< \mu$, cofinal in $\prod_{(i,\ell) \in Y^*} \gamma_{i,\ell}^*/D_0$. For each $g \in G^*$ for some $\alpha(g) < \mu$ we have $g < g_{\alpha(g)}^*$, hence $\alpha \in [\alpha(g), \mu) \Rightarrow g <_{D_0} g_\alpha^*$, let $\alpha(*) = \sup\{\alpha(g) : g \in G\}$ so $\alpha(*) < \mu$ so $\bigwedge_{g \in G} g <_{D_0} g_{\alpha(*)}^*$; contradiction, so $\otimes$ holds].

So for some ultrafilter D^* on Y^* extending D_0 , $\mu \leq \text{tcf}\left(\prod_{(i,\ell) \in Y^*} \gamma_{i,\ell}^*/D^*\right)$, hence

$$\mu \leq \text{tcf} \prod_{(i,\ell) \in Y^*} \text{cf}(\gamma_{i,\ell}^*/D^*) \text{ and by [Sh:g, II,1.3] for some}$$

$$\lambda'_{i,\ell} = \text{cf}(\lambda'_{i,\ell}) \leq \text{cf}(\gamma_{i,\ell}^*) \leq \gamma_i < \lambda_i \text{ we have } \mu = \text{tcf}\left(\prod_{(i,\ell) \in Y^*} \lambda'_{i,\ell}/D^*\right) \text{ as required}$$

(we could, instead of relying on this quotation, analyze more).

$(\beta)^- \Rightarrow (\beta)'$

Let $B_{i,\gamma}$ be the interval Boolean algebra on γ for $\gamma < \lambda_i, i < \kappa$, and we let $B_{i,\gamma}^*$ be generated by $\{a_j^{i,\gamma} : j < \gamma\}$ freely except $a_{j_1}^{i,\gamma} \leq a_{j_2}^{i,\gamma}$ for $j_1 < j_2 < \gamma_i$. So without loss of generality B_i is the disjoint sum of $\{B_{i,\gamma}^* : \gamma < \lambda_i\}$. Let $e_{i,\gamma} = 1_{B_{i,\gamma}}$ (so $\langle e_{i,\gamma} : \gamma < \lambda_i \rangle$ is a maximal antichain of B_i , $B_i \upharpoonright \{x \in B_i : x \leq e_{i,\gamma}\}$ is isomorphic to $B_{i,\gamma}$ and B_i is generated by $\{x : (\exists \gamma < \lambda_i)(x \leq e_{i,\gamma})\}$. Let $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ and an ideal J of B exemplify clause $(\beta)^-$.

Let I_i be the ideal of B_i generated by $\{e_{i,\gamma} : \gamma < \lambda_i\}$, so it is a maximal ideal; let I be such that $(B, I) = \prod_{i < \kappa} (B_i, I_i)/D$ so clearly $|B/I| = |2^\kappa/D| \leq 2^\kappa < \text{cf}(\mu)$ (actually $|B/I| = 2$), so without loss of generality $\alpha < \beta \leq \mu \Rightarrow f_\alpha/D = f_\beta/D \pmod I$. We can use $\langle f_{1+\alpha}/D - f_0/D : \alpha < \mu \rangle$, so without loss of generality $f_\alpha/D \in I$, hence without loss of generality $f_\alpha(i) \in I_i$ for $\alpha < \mu, i < \kappa$.

Let $f_\alpha(i) = \tau_{\alpha,i}(\dots, e_{i,\gamma(\alpha,i,\varepsilon)}, a_{j(\alpha,i,\varepsilon)}^{i,\gamma(\alpha,i,\varepsilon)}, \dots)_{\varepsilon < n_{\alpha,i}}$ where $n_{\alpha,i} < \omega$ and $\tau_{\alpha,i}$ is a Boolean term. As μ is regular $> 2^\kappa$, without loss of generality $\tau_{\alpha,i} = \tau_i$ and $n_{\alpha,i} = n_i$. Let $\gamma_{\alpha,i,\varepsilon}^0 = \gamma(\alpha,i,\varepsilon)$ and $\gamma_{\alpha,i,\varepsilon}^1 = j(\alpha,i,\ell)$.

By [Sh 430, 6.6D] (or better [Sh 513, 6.1]) we can find a subset A of $A^* = \{(i, \varepsilon, \ell) : i < \kappa \text{ and } \varepsilon < n_i \text{ and } \ell < 2\}$ and $\langle \gamma_{i,n,\ell}^* : i < \kappa \text{ and } n < n_i \text{ and } \ell < 2 \rangle$ such that:

$$(*) (A) \quad (i, \varepsilon, \ell) \in A \Rightarrow \text{cf}(\gamma_{i,\varepsilon,\ell}^*) > 2^\kappa$$

$$(B) \quad \text{for every } g \in \prod_{(i,n,\ell) \in A} \gamma_{i,n,\ell}^* \text{ for arbitrarily large } \alpha < \mu \text{ we have}$$

$$(i, n, \ell) \in A^* \setminus A \Rightarrow \gamma_{\alpha,i,n}^\ell = \gamma_{i,n,\ell}^*$$

$$(i, n, \ell) \in A \Rightarrow g(i, n, \ell) < \gamma_{\alpha, i, n}^\ell < \gamma_{i, n, \ell}^*.$$

Let

$$\beta_{i, n, \ell}^* = \sup\{\gamma_{i, n', \ell'}^* : n' < n, \ell' < 2 \text{ and } \gamma_{i, n', \ell'}^* < \gamma_{i, n, \ell}^*\}$$

(can use $n < n_i$). Without loss of generality

$$(i, n, \ell) \in A^* \ \& \ \alpha < \mu \Rightarrow \gamma_{\alpha, i, n}^\ell \in (\beta_{i, n, \ell}^*, \gamma_{i, n, \ell}^*)$$

$$(i, n, \ell) \in A^* \setminus A \ \& \ \alpha < \mu \Rightarrow \gamma_{\alpha, i, n}^\ell = \gamma_{i, n, \ell}^*.$$

Also without loss of generality

(*) for $\alpha < \mu$ and $(i, n, \ell) \in A$ we have

$$\gamma_{2\alpha+1, i, n}^\ell > \sup\left\{\gamma_{2\alpha, i, n'}^{\ell'} : i < \kappa, \ell' < 2, n' < n_i, \text{ and } \gamma_{2\alpha, i, n'}^{\ell'} < \gamma_{i, n, \ell}^*\right\}.$$

Let $\Delta_i = \{\gamma_{i, n, 0}^* : n < n_i \text{ and } (i, n, 0) \in A^* \setminus A\}$ and

$$B'_i = B_i \upharpoonright \sum\{e_{i, \gamma} : \gamma \in \Delta_i\}.$$

We define $f'_\alpha \in \prod_{i < \kappa} B'_i$ by $f'_\alpha(i) = f_{2\alpha+1}(i) \cap (\bigcup_{\gamma \in \Delta_i} e_{i, \gamma}) \in B'_i \subseteq B_i$.

Now easily $f'_\alpha/D \leq f_{2\alpha+1}/D$ and (in B) $f_{2\alpha}/D - f'_\alpha/D \leq f_{2\alpha}/D - f'_{2\alpha+1}/D \in J$, hence modulo J , also $\langle f'_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is increasing. So $\langle B'_i : i < \kappa \rangle, \langle f'_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ form a witness, too. But B'_i is isomorphic to the interval Boolean algebra of the ordinal $\gamma_i = \sum_{\gamma \in \Delta_i} \gamma < \lambda$, so we are almost done. Well, γ_i is an ordinal, not necessarily a cardinal, but in the proof of $(\beta) \Rightarrow (\gamma)$ we allow the γ_i to be ordinals $< \lambda_i$ and $(\gamma) \Rightarrow (\beta)$ was proved too. $\square_{3.6}$

§4 ON EXISTENCE OF INDEPENDENT SETS (FOR STABLE THEORIES)

The following is motivated by questions of Bays [Bay] which continues some investigations of [Sh:a] (better see [Sh:c]) dealing with questions on $\text{Pr}_T(\mu), \text{Pr}_T^*$ for stable T (see Definition 4.2 below). We connect this to pcf, using [Sh 430, 3.17] and also [Sh 513, 6.12]). We assume basic knowledge on non-forking (see [Sh:c, Ch.III,I]) and we say some things on the combinatorics but the rest of the paper does not depend on this section.

4.1 Claim. *Assume $\lambda > \theta \geq \kappa$ are regular uncountable. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (B) *If $\mu < \lambda$ and $a_\alpha \in [\mu]^{<\kappa}$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ then for some $A \in [\lambda]^\lambda$ we have $\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} a_\alpha$ has cardinality $< \theta$*
- (C) *if $\delta = \text{cf}(\delta) < \kappa$ and $\eta_\alpha \in {}^\delta \lambda$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ and $|\{\eta_\alpha \upharpoonright i : \alpha < \lambda, i < \delta\}| < \lambda$ then for some $A \in [\lambda]^\lambda$ the set $\{\eta_\alpha \upharpoonright i : \alpha \in A, i < \delta\}$ has cardinality $< \theta$.*

Proof. (B) $\Rightarrow$ (C). Immediate.

$\neg(B) \Rightarrow \neg(C)$

Case 1: For some $\mu \in (\theta, \lambda)$, $\text{cf}(\mu) < \kappa$ and $\text{pp}(\mu) \geq \lambda$. Without loss of generality μ is minimal.

So

$$(*) \quad \mathfrak{a} \subseteq \text{Reg} \cap \mu \setminus \theta, |\mathfrak{a}| < \kappa, \sup(\mathfrak{a}) < \mu \Rightarrow \max \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{a}) < \mu.$$

Subcase 1a: $\lambda < \text{pp}^+(\mu)$.

So by [Sh:g, Ch.VII,1.6(2)], (if $\text{cf}(\mu) > \aleph_0$) and [Sh 430, 6.5;] (if $\text{cf}(\mu) = \aleph_0$) we can find $\langle \lambda_\alpha : \alpha < \text{cf}(\mu) \rangle$, a strictly increasing sequence of regulars from (θ, μ) with

limit μ and ideal J on $\text{cf}(\mu)$ satisfying $J_{\text{cf}(\mu)}^{bd} \subseteq J$ such that $\lambda = \text{tcf} \left(\prod_{\alpha < \text{cf}(\mu)} \lambda_\alpha / J \right)$

and $\max \text{pcf}\{\lambda_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} < \lambda_\alpha$. By [Sh:g, II,3.5], there is $\langle f_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda \rangle$ which is $<_J$ -increasing cofinal in $\prod_{\alpha < \text{cf}(\mu)} \lambda_\alpha / J$ with $|\{f_\zeta \upharpoonright \alpha : \zeta < \lambda\}| < \lambda_\alpha$.

Easily $\langle f_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda \rangle$ exemplifies $\neg(C)$: if $A \in [\lambda]^\lambda$ and $B =: \bigcup_{\zeta \in A} \text{Range}(f_\zeta)$ has

cardinality $< \mu$ let $g \in \prod_{\alpha} \lambda_\alpha$ be: $g(\alpha) = \sup(\lambda_\alpha \cap B)$ if $< \lambda_\alpha$, zero otherwise and let

$\alpha_0 = \text{Min}\{\alpha < \text{cf}(\mu) : \lambda_\alpha > |B|\}$. So $\alpha_0 < \text{cf}(\mu)$ and $\zeta \in A \Rightarrow f_\zeta \upharpoonright [\alpha_0, \text{cf}(\mu)) < g$, contradiction to “ $<_J$ -cofinal”.

Subcase 1b: $\text{cf}(\mu) > \aleph_0$ and $\text{pp}^+(\mu) = \text{pp}(\mu) = \lambda$. Use [Sh 513, §6] and finish as above.

Subcase 1c: $\text{cf}(\mu) = \aleph_0$ and $\lambda = \text{pp}^+(\mu) = \text{pp}(\mu) = \lambda$.

Let $\mathbf{a}, \langle \mathbf{b}_\tau : \tau \in R \rangle, \langle f_\tau : \tau \in R \rangle$ be as in [Sh 513, 6.x], so $|\mathbf{b}_\tau| = \aleph_0$. Let η_τ be an ω -sequence of ordinals enumerating $\text{Rang}(f_\tau)$ for $\tau \in R$, now $\{\eta_\tau : \tau \in R\}$ is as required.

Case 2: Not Case 1.

So by [Sh:g, Ch.II,5.4], we have $\theta \leq \mu < \lambda \Rightarrow \text{cov}(\mu, \theta, \kappa, \aleph_1) < \lambda$.

As we are assuming $\neg(B)$, we can find $\mu_0 < \lambda, a_\alpha \in [\mu_0]^{<\kappa}$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ such that $A \in [\lambda]^\lambda \Rightarrow |\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} a_\alpha| \geq \theta$, but by the previous sentence we can find $\mu_1 < \lambda$ and

$\{b_\beta : \beta < \mu_1\} \subseteq [\mu_0]^{<\theta}$ such that: every $a \in [\mu_0]^{<\kappa}$ is included in the union of $\leq \aleph_0$ sets from $\{b_\beta : \beta < \mu_1\}$. So we can find $c_\alpha \in [\mu_1]^{\aleph_0}$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ such that $a_\alpha \subseteq \bigcup_{\beta \in c_\alpha} b_\beta$. Now for $A \in [\lambda]^\lambda$, if $|\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} c_\alpha| < \theta$ then

$$\begin{aligned} |\bigcup \{a_\alpha : \alpha \in A\}| &\subseteq |\bigcup \{ \bigcup_{\beta \in c_\alpha} b_\beta : \alpha \in A \}| \\ &= |\bigcup \{b_\beta : \beta \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} c_\alpha\}| < \min\{\sigma : \sigma = \text{cf}(\sigma) > |b_\beta| \text{ for } \beta < \mu_1\} \\ &\quad + |\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} c_\alpha|^+ \leq \theta + \theta = \theta \end{aligned}$$

contradicting the choice of $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$.

So

$$\begin{aligned} (*) \quad &c_\alpha \in [\mu_1]^{\leq \aleph_0}, \text{ for } \alpha < \lambda, \mu_1 < \lambda \text{ and} \\ &A \in [\lambda]^\lambda \Rightarrow |\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} c_\alpha| \geq \theta. \end{aligned}$$

Let η_α be an ω -sequence enumerating c_α , so $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is a counterexample to clause (C). $\square_{4.1}$

We concentrate below on λ, θ, κ regular (others can be reduced to it).

4.2 Definition. Let $\mathbf{T}$ be a complete first order theory; which is stable ($\mathfrak{C}$ the monster model of T and $A, B, \dots$ denote subsets of $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$ of cardinality $< \|\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}\|$).

1) $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}(\lambda, \chi, \theta)$ means:

- (*) if $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}, |A| = \lambda$ then we can find $A' \subseteq A, |A'| = \chi$ and $B', |B'| < \theta$ such that A' is independent over B' (i.e. $a \in A' \Rightarrow \text{tp}(a, B' \cup (A' \setminus \{a\}))$ does not fork over B').

2) $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}^*(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta)$ means:

- (**) if $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$ is independent over B where $|A| = \lambda$ and $|B| < \mu, B \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$ then there are $A' \subseteq A, |A'| = \chi$ and $B' \subseteq B$ satisfying $|B'| < \theta$ such that $\text{tp}(A', B)$ does not fork over B' (hence A' is independent over B').

3) $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}^*(\lambda, \chi, \theta)$ means $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}^*(\lambda, \lambda, \chi, \theta)$.

4.3 *Fact.* Assume λ is regular $> \theta \geq \kappa_r(\mathbf{T})$ then

- (1) if $\chi = \lambda$ then $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}(\lambda, \chi, \theta) \Leftrightarrow \text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}^*(\lambda, \lambda, \chi, \theta)$
- (2) if $\lambda \geq \chi \geq \mu \geq \theta$ then $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}(\lambda, \chi, \theta) \Rightarrow \text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}^*(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta)$.

Proof. 1) The direction $\Leftarrow$ is by the proof in [Sh:a, III].

[Let A, B be given (the B is not really necessary), such that $\lambda = |A| > |B| + \kappa_r(\mathbf{T})$ so let $A = \{a_i : i < \lambda\}$; define

$A_i = \{a_j : j < i\}$, $S = \{i < \lambda : \text{cf}(i) \geq \kappa_r(\mathbf{T})\}$, so by the definition of $\kappa_r(\mathbf{T})$ for $\alpha \in S$ there is $j_\alpha < \alpha$ such that $\text{tp}(a_\alpha, A_\alpha \cup B)$ does not fork over $A_{j_\alpha} \cup B$ so for some j^* the set $S' = \{\delta \in S : j_\delta = j^*\}$ is stationary, now apply the right side with $\{a_\delta : \delta \in S'\}$, $A_{j^*} \cup B$, here standing for A, B there].

The other direction $\Rightarrow$ follows by part (2).

2) This is easy, too, by the non-forking calculus [Sh:a, III, Th.0.1 + (0)-(4), pgs.82-84] or just read the proof. Let $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$ be independent over B , where $|A| = \lambda$ and $|B| < \mu$. As we are assuming $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}(\lambda, \chi, \theta)$ there is $A' \subseteq A$, $|A'| = \chi$ and $B', |B'| < \theta$ such that A' is independent over B' . So for every finite $\bar{c} \subseteq B$ for some $A_{\bar{c}} \subseteq A'$ of cardinality $< \kappa(\mathbf{T})$ ($\leq \kappa_r(\mathbf{T})$) we have: $A' \setminus A_{\bar{c}}$ is independent over $B' \cup \bar{c}$. So $A^* = \bigcup \{A_{\bar{c}} : \bar{c} \subseteq B \text{ finite}\}$ has cardinality $< \kappa_r(\mathbf{T}) + |B|^+ \leq \chi$ so necessarily $A' \setminus A^*$ has cardinality χ and it is independent over $\bigcup \{\bar{c} : \bar{c} \subseteq B \text{ finite}\} \cup B' = B \cup B'$.]

□_{4.3}

4.4 *Discussion.* So it suffices to prove the equivalence

$\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}^*(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta) \Leftrightarrow \text{Pr}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa)$ with $\kappa = \kappa_r(\mathbf{T})$, where

4.5 Definition. Assume

- (*) $\lambda \geq \max\{\mu, \chi\} \geq \min\{\mu, \chi\} \geq \theta \geq \kappa > \aleph_0$ and $\mu > \theta$ and for simplicity λ, θ, κ are regular if not said otherwise (as the general case can be reduced to this case).

1) $\text{Pr}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa)$ is defined as follows: if $a_\alpha \in [\mu]^{<\kappa}$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ and $|\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} a_\alpha| < \mu$

then there is $Y \in [\lambda]^\chi$ such that $|\bigcup_{\alpha \in Y} a_\alpha| < \theta$;

2) $\text{Pr}^{\text{tr}}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa)$ is defined similarly but for some tree T each a_α is a branch nl of T .

3) We write $\text{Pr}(\lambda, \leq \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa)$ for $\text{Pr}(\lambda, \mu^+, \chi, \theta, \kappa)$ and similarly for Pr^{tr} and $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}^*$.

4.6 *Fact.* Assume $\lambda, \mu = \chi, \chi, \theta, \kappa = \kappa_i(\mathbf{T})$ satisfies (*) of Definition 4.5. Then

- 1) $\text{Pr}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa_r(\mathbf{T})) \Rightarrow \text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}^*(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta) \Rightarrow \text{Pr}^{\text{tr}}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa_r(\mathbf{T}))$.
- 2) $\text{Pr}(\lambda, \chi, \chi, \theta, \kappa_r(\mathbf{T})) \Rightarrow \text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}(\lambda, \chi, \theta) \Rightarrow \text{Pr}^{\text{tr}}(\lambda, \chi, \chi, \theta, \kappa_r(\mathbf{T}))$.
- 3) We have obvious monotonicity properties.

Proof. Straight.

1) First we prove the first implication so assume $\text{Pr}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa_i(\mathbf{T}))$, let $\kappa = \kappa_i(\mathbf{T})$, hence $(*)$ of 4.5 holds and we shall prove $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}^*(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta)$. So (see Definition 4.2(2)) we have $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$ is independent over $B \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$, $|A| = \lambda$ and $|B| < \mu$. Let $A = \{a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$, with no repetitions of course and $B = \{b_j : j < j(*)\}$ so $i(*) < \mu$. For each $\alpha < \lambda$, there is a subset u_α of $j(*)$ of cardinality $< \kappa_r(\mathbf{T}) = \kappa$ such that $\text{tp}(a_\alpha, B)$ does not fork over $\{b_j : j \in u_\alpha\}$. So $u_i \in [\mu]^{<\kappa}$ and $|\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} u_\alpha| \leq |j(*)| < \mu$ hence

as we are assuming $\text{Pr}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa)$, there is $Y \in [\lambda]^\chi$ such that $|\bigcup_{\alpha \in Y} u_\alpha| < \theta$. Let

$$B' = \{b_j : j \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in Y} u_\alpha\}, A' = \{a_\alpha : \alpha \in Y\} \text{ so } B' \subseteq B, |B'| < \theta \text{ and } A' \subseteq A, |A'| = \chi$$

and by the nonforking calculus, $\text{tp}(A', B)$ does not fork over B' (even $\{a_\alpha : \alpha \in Y\}$ is independent over (B, B')).

Second, we prove the second implication, so we assume $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{T}}^*(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta)$ and we shall prove $\text{Pr}^{\text{tr}}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa_r(\mathbf{T}))$. Let $\kappa = \kappa_r(\mathbf{T})$.

Let T be a tree and for $\alpha < \lambda$, a_α a branch, $|a| < \kappa$, $|\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} a_\alpha| < \mu$. Without loss of generality $T = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} a_\alpha$, $\lambda = \bigcup_{\zeta < \kappa} A_\zeta$, where $A_\zeta = \{\alpha : \text{otp}(a_\alpha) = \zeta\}$. Without loss of generality $T \subseteq {}^{\kappa > \mu} \mu$, $T = \bigcup_{\zeta < \kappa} T_\zeta$ such that

$$\eta \in T_\zeta \setminus \{<>\} \Rightarrow \eta(0) = \zeta,$$

T_ζ can be replaced by $\{\eta \restriction C_\zeta : \eta \in T_\zeta\}$ where $0 \in C_\zeta$, $\text{otp } C = 1 + \text{cf}(\zeta)$, $\text{sup}(C) = \zeta$. So without loss of generality

$$T = \cup \{T_\sigma : \sigma \in \text{Reg} \cap \kappa_T\}$$

$$<> \neq \eta \in T_\sigma \Rightarrow \eta(0) = \sigma.$$

Without loss of generality $\lambda = \cup \{A_\sigma : \sigma \in \text{Reg} \cap \kappa\}$ and $A \bigcup_{\alpha \in A_\sigma} a_\alpha = T_\sigma$. It is enough to take care of one σ (otherwise little more work). So without loss of generality:

$$\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow \text{otp}(a_\alpha) = \sigma.$$

As $\sigma = \text{cf}(\sigma) < \kappa$ there are $A_i \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$ such that $\langle A_i : i \leq \sigma \rangle$ increase continuously and $p \in S(A_\sigma) \bigwedge_{i < \sigma} p \restriction A_{i+1}$ forks over A_i say $\varphi(x, c_i) \in p \restriction A_{i+1}$ forks over A_i and $A_i = \{c_j : j < i\}$.

By nonforking calculus we can find $\langle f_\eta : \eta \in T \rangle, f_\eta$ elementary mapping

$$\text{Dom}(f_\eta) = A_{\ell g(\eta)}$$

$\langle f_\eta : \eta \in T \rangle$ nonforking tree, that is

$$\nu \triangleleft \eta \Rightarrow \text{tp}(\text{Rang}(f_\eta), \cup \{\text{Rang}(f_\rho) : \rho \in T, \rho \upharpoonright \ell g(\nu) + 1 \not\triangleleft \eta\})$$

does not fork over A_ν .

For $\alpha < \lambda$, let $g_\alpha = \cup \{f_\nu : \nu \in a_\alpha\}$, $A_\alpha = \bigcup_{\nu u \in a_\alpha} \text{Rang}(f_\nu) = g_\alpha(A_\sigma)$ and $p_\alpha = g_\alpha(p)$.

Let $b_\alpha \in \mathfrak{C}$ realize

$$A_\eta = \text{Rang}(f_\eta)$$

$$\text{tp}(b_\alpha, \bigcup_{\eta \in T} A_\eta \cup \{b_\beta : \beta \neq \alpha\}) \text{ does not fork over } A_\alpha.$$

Now we apply $\text{Pr}_T^*(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta)$ on

$$A = \{b_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$$

$$B = \bigcup_{\eta \in T} A_\eta.$$

So there are $A' \subseteq A$, $|A'| = \chi$ and $B' \subseteq B$, $|B'| < \theta$, $\text{tp}(A', B)$ does not fork over B' , hence (for some $y \in [\lambda]^\chi$) we have $A' = \{a_\alpha : \alpha \in Y\}$ independent over B' . So there is $T' \subseteq T$ subtree such that $|T'| = |B'| + \sigma < \theta$ such that $B' \subseteq \bigcup_{\rho \in T'} A_\rho$. Throwing

“few” ($< |B'|^+ + \kappa_r(\mathbf{T})$) members of A' that is of Y we get A' independent over B' .

Easily Y is as required.

Discussion So if $\text{Pr}, \text{Pr}^{tr}$ are equivalent, $\kappa = \kappa_r(\mathbf{T})$ then Pr_T^* is equivalent to them (for the suitable cardinal parameter, so we would like to prove such equivalence). Now 4.1 gives the equivalence when $\theta = \kappa_r(\mathbf{T})$, $\lambda = \chi = \text{cf}(\lambda)$ and “for every $\mu < \lambda$ ”. We give below more general cases; e.g. if λ is a successor of regular or $\{\delta < \lambda : \text{cf}(\delta) = \theta^*\} \in I(\lambda)$ or ...

4.7 Fact. Assume $\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa$ as in (*) of Definition 4.5 and $\mu^* \in [\theta, \mu)$ and $\text{cf}(\mu^*) < \kappa$.

0) $\text{Pr}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa) \Rightarrow \text{Pr}^{tr}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa)$.

[Why? Straight].

1) If $\kappa < \lambda$ and $\mu < \lambda$ and $\text{cf}(\mu) \geq \kappa$, then $\text{Pr}(\lambda, \leq \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa) \Leftrightarrow (\forall \mu_1 < \mu) \text{Pr}(\lambda, \leq \mu_1, \chi, \theta, \kappa)$; similarly for Pr^{tr} .

2) If $\text{pp}(\mu^*) > \lambda$ then $\neg \text{Pr}^{tr}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa)$ (by [Sh 355, 1.5A], see [Sh 513, 6.10]).

3) If $\text{pp}(\mu^*) \geq \lambda$ and

(a) $\{\delta < \lambda : \text{cf}(\delta) = \theta\} \in I[\lambda]$ or just

(a)⁻ for some $S \in I[\lambda]$, $(\forall \delta \in S), \text{cf}(\delta) = \theta$ and

(a)_S for every closed $e \subseteq \lambda$ of order type χ , $e \cap S \neq \emptyset$.

Then $\neg \text{Pr}^{\text{tr}}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa)$.

[Why? As in [Sh:g, Ch.VIII,6.4] based on [Sh:g, Ch.II,5.4] better still [Sh:g, Ch.II,3.5]].

4) If λ is a successor of regular and $\theta^+ < \lambda$, then the assumption (b) of part (3) holds (see [Sh:g, Ch.VIII,6.1] based on [Sh 351, §4]).

5) If $\mu < \lambda$ and $\text{cov}(\mu, \theta, \kappa, \aleph_1) < \lambda$ (equivalently

$(\forall \tau)[\theta < \tau \leq \mu \ \& \ \text{cf}(\tau) < \kappa \rightarrow \text{pp}_{\aleph_1\text{-complete}}(\tau) < \lambda]$), then $\neg \text{Pr}(\lambda, \mu^+, \chi, \theta, \kappa)$ implies that for some $\mu_1 \in (\mu, \lambda)$ we have $\neg \text{Pr}(\lambda, \mu_1, \chi, \theta, \aleph_1)$ (as in Case 2 in the proof of 4.1).

6) $\text{Pr}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \aleph_1) \Leftrightarrow \text{Pr}^{\text{tr}}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \aleph_1)$.

7) $\text{Pr}(\lambda, \mu, \lambda, \theta, \kappa)$ iff for every $\tau \in [\theta, \mu)$ we have: $\text{Pr}(\lambda, \leq \tau, \lambda, \tau, \kappa)$; similarly for Pr^{tr} .

8) $\text{Pr}(\lambda, \leq \mu, \lambda, \theta, \kappa)$ iff $\text{Pr}^{\text{tr}}(\lambda, \leq \mu, \lambda, \theta, \kappa)$ (by 4.1).

4.8 Claim. *Under GCH we get equivalence: $\text{Pr}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa) \Leftrightarrow \text{Pr}^{\text{tr}}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa)$.*

Proof. $\text{Pr} \Rightarrow \text{Pr}^{\text{tr}}$ is trivial; so let us prove $\neg \text{Pr} \Rightarrow \neg \text{Pr}^{\text{tr}}$, so assume

$\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \subseteq [\mu]^{<\kappa}$ exemplifies $\neg \text{Pr}(\lambda, \mu, \chi, \theta, \kappa)$. Without loss of generality $|a_\alpha| = \kappa^* < \kappa$. By 4.7(1) without loss of generality $\lambda > \mu$, so necessarily

(c) $\lambda = \mu^+, \mu > \kappa^* \geq \text{cf}(\mu)$ or

(d) $\lambda = \mu^+, \kappa = \lambda$.

In Case (a) let T be the set of sequences of bounded subsets of μ each of cardinality $\leq \kappa^*$ of length $< \text{Min}\{\text{cf}(\mu), \kappa^*\}$. For each $\alpha < \lambda$ let $\bar{b}^\alpha = \langle b_{\alpha, \varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \text{cf}(\mu) \rangle$ be a sequence, every initial segment is in T and $a_\alpha = \bigcup_{\varepsilon < \text{cf}(\mu)} b_{\alpha, \varepsilon}$, so

$t_\alpha = \{\bar{b}^\alpha \restriction \zeta : \zeta < \text{cf}(\mu)\}$ is a $\text{cf}(\mu)$ -branch of T , and it should be clear.

4.9 Remark. We can get independence result: by instances of Chang's Conjecture (so the consistency strength seems somewhat more than huge cardinals, see Foreman [For], Levinski Magidor Shelah [LMSH 198]).

§5 CARDINAL INVARIANTS FOR GENERAL REGULAR
CARDINALS: RESTRICTION ON THE DEPTH

Cummings and Shelah [CuSh 541] prove that there are no non-trivial restrictions on some cardinal invariants like $\mathfrak{b}$ and $\mathfrak{d}$, even for all regular cardinals simultaneously; i.e., on functions like $\langle \mathfrak{b}_\lambda : \lambda \in \text{Reg} \rangle$. But not everything is independent of ZFC. Consider the cardinal invariants $\mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{\ell+}$, defined below.

5.1 Definition. 1) For an ideal J on a regular cardinal λ let
if $\lambda > \aleph_0$

$$\mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{1+} = \text{Min} \left\{ \theta : \text{there is no sequence } \langle C_\alpha : \alpha < \theta \rangle \text{ such that:} \right. \\ \begin{aligned} (a) \quad & C_\alpha \text{ is a club of } \lambda, \\ (b) \quad & \alpha < \beta \Rightarrow |C_\alpha \setminus C_\beta| < \lambda, \\ (c) \quad & C_{\alpha+1} \subseteq \text{acc}(C_\alpha) \end{aligned} \left. \right\}.$$

where $\text{acc}(C)$ is the set of accumulation points of C .
If $\lambda \geq \aleph_0$

$$\mathfrak{dp}_{\lambda,J}^{2+} = \text{Min} \left\{ \mu : \text{there are no } f_\alpha \in {}^\lambda \lambda \text{ for} \right. \\ \left. \alpha < \mu \text{ such that } \alpha < \beta < \mu \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_J f_\beta \right\}.$$

if $\lambda \geq \aleph_0$

$$\mathfrak{dp}_{\lambda,J}^{3+} = \text{Min} \left\{ \mu : \text{there is no sequence } \langle A_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle \text{ such that:} \right. \\ \begin{aligned} & A_\alpha \in J^+ \text{ and} \\ & \alpha < \beta < \mu \Rightarrow [A_\beta \setminus A_\alpha \in J^+ \ \& \ A_\alpha \setminus A_\beta \in J] \end{aligned} \left. \right\}.$$

If $J = J_\lambda^{bd}$, we may omit it. We can replace J by its dual filter.
2) For a regular cardinal λ let

$$\mathfrak{d}_\lambda = \text{Min} \left\{ |F| : F \subseteq {}^\lambda \lambda \text{ and } (\forall g \in {}^\lambda \lambda)(\exists f \in F)(g <_{J_\lambda^{bd}} f) \right\}$$

(equivalently $g < f$)

$$\mathfrak{b}_\lambda = \text{Min} \left\{ |F| : F \subseteq {}^\lambda \lambda \text{ and } \neg(\exists g \in {}^\lambda \lambda)(\forall f \in F)[f <_{J_\lambda^{bd}} g] \right\}.$$

We shall prove here that in the “neighborhood” of singular cardinals there are some connections between the $\mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{\ell+}$'s (hence by monotonicity, also with the $\mathfrak{b}_\lambda$'s).

We first note connections for “one λ ”.

5.2 *Fact.* 1) If $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > \aleph_0$ then

$$\mathfrak{b}_\lambda < \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{1+} \leq \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{2+} \leq \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{3+}.$$

2) $\mathfrak{b}_{\aleph_0} < \mathfrak{dp}_{\aleph_0}^{2+} = \mathfrak{dp}_{\aleph_0}^{3+}$.

3) In the definition of $\mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{1+}$, $C_{\alpha+1} \subseteq \text{acc}(C_\alpha) \bmod J_\lambda^{\text{bd}}$ suffice.

Proof. 1) First inequality: $\mathfrak{b}_\lambda < \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{1+}$.

We choose by induction on $\alpha < \mathfrak{b}_\lambda$, a club C_α of λ such that $\beta < \alpha \Rightarrow |C_\beta \setminus C_\alpha| < \lambda$ and $\beta < \alpha \Rightarrow C_{\beta+1} \subseteq \text{acc}(C_\beta)$.

For $\alpha = 0$ let $C_\alpha = \lambda$, for $\alpha = \beta+1$ let $C_\alpha = \text{acc}(C_\beta)$, and for α limit let, for each $\beta < \alpha$, $f_\beta \in {}^\lambda \lambda$ be defined by $f_\beta(i) = \text{Min}(C_\alpha \setminus (i+1))$. So $\{f_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ is a subset of ${}^\lambda \lambda$ of cardinality $\leq |\alpha| < \mathfrak{b}_\lambda$, so there is $g_\alpha \in {}^\lambda \lambda$ such that $\beta < \alpha \Rightarrow f_\beta <_{J_\lambda^{\text{bd}}} g_\alpha$.

Lastly, let $C_\alpha = \{\delta < \lambda : \delta \text{ a limit ordinal such that } (\forall \zeta < \delta)[g_\alpha(\zeta) < \delta]\}$, now C_α is as required.

So $\langle C_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{b}_\lambda \rangle$ exemplifies $\mathfrak{b}_\lambda < \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{1+}$.

Second inequality: $\mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{1+} \leq \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{2+}$

Assume $\mu < \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{1+}$. Let $\langle C_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ exemplify it, and let us define for $\alpha < \mu$ the function $f_\alpha \in {}^\lambda \lambda$ by: $f_\alpha(\zeta)$ is the $(\zeta+1)$ -th member of C_α ; clearly $f_\alpha \in {}^\lambda \lambda$ and f_α is strictly increasing. Also, if $\beta < \alpha$ then $C_\beta \setminus C_\alpha$ is a bounded subset of λ , say by δ_1 , and there is $\delta_2 \in (\delta_1, \lambda)$ such that $\text{otp}(\delta_2 \cap C_\beta) = \delta_2$. So for every $\zeta \in [\delta_2, \lambda)$ clearly $f_\beta(\zeta) =$ the $(\zeta+1)$ -th member of $C_\beta =$ the $(\zeta+1)$ -th member of $C_\beta \setminus \delta_1 \leq$ the $(\zeta+1)$ -th member of C_α . So $\beta < \alpha \Rightarrow f_\beta \leq_{J_\lambda^{\text{bd}}} f_\alpha$. Lastly, for $\alpha < \mu$, $C_{\alpha+1} \subseteq \text{acc}(C_\alpha)$ hence $f_\alpha(\zeta) =$ the $(\zeta+1)$ -th member of $C_\alpha <$ the $(\zeta+\omega)$ -th member of $C_\alpha \leq$ the $(\zeta+1)$ -th member of $\text{acc}(C_\alpha) \leq$ the $(\zeta+1)$ -th member of $C_{\alpha+1}$. So $\beta < \alpha \Rightarrow f_\beta <_{J_\lambda^{\text{bd}}} f_{\beta+1} \leq_{J_\lambda^{\text{bd}}} f_\alpha$, so $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ exemplifies $\mu < \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{2+}$.

Third inequality: $\mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{2+} \leq \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{3+}$

Assume $\mu < \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{2+}$ and let $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ exemplify this.

Let $c : \lambda \times \lambda \rightarrow \lambda$ be one to one and let

$$A_\alpha = \{c(\zeta, \xi) : \zeta < \lambda \text{ and } \xi < f_\alpha(\zeta)\} \cdot a$$

Now $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ exemplifies $\mu < \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{3+}$.

2), 3) Easy.

□_{5.2}

5.3 Observation. Suppose $\lambda = cf(\lambda) > \aleph_0$.

- 1) If $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha \leq \gamma^* \rangle$ is $<_{J_\lambda^{bd}}$ -increasing then we can find a sequence $\langle C_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma^* \rangle$ of clubs of λ , such that $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow |C_\alpha \setminus C_\beta| < \lambda$ and $C_{\alpha+1} \subseteq acc(C_\alpha) \bmod J_\lambda^{bd}$.
 2) $\mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{1+} = \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{2+}$ or for some μ , $\mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{1+} = \mu^+$, $\mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{2+} = \mu^{++}$ (moreover though there is in $(^\lambda \lambda, <_{J_\lambda^{bd}})$ an increasing sequence of length μ^+ , there is none of length $\mu^+ + 1$).

Proof. 1) Let

$$C^* = \left\{ \delta < \lambda : \delta \text{ a limit ordinal and } (\forall \beta < \delta) f_{\gamma^*}(\beta) < \delta \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \omega^\delta = \delta \text{ (ordinal exponentiation)} \right\};$$

this is a club of λ .

For each $\alpha < \gamma^*$ let

$$C_\alpha = \left\{ \delta + \omega^{f_\alpha(\delta)} \cdot \beta : \delta \in C^* \text{ and } \beta < f_\alpha(\delta) \right. \\ \left. \text{and } f_\alpha(\delta) < f_{\gamma^*}(\delta) \right\}.$$

2) Follows. □_{5.3}

Now we come to our main concern.

5.4 Theorem. Assume

- (a) κ is regular uncountable, $\ell \in \{1, 2, 3\}$
- (b) $\langle \mu_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is (strictly) increasing continuous with limit μ ,
 $\lambda_i = \mu_i^+$, $\lambda = \mu^+$
- (c) $2^\kappa < \mu$ and $\mu_i^\kappa < \mu$
- (d) D a normal filter on κ
- (e) $\theta_i < \mathfrak{dp}_{\lambda_i}^{\ell+}$ and $\theta = \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \kappa} \theta_i / D)$ or just

$$\theta < \text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} \theta_i / D).$$

Then $\theta < \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{\ell+}$.

Proof. By 5.15, 5.16, 5.6 below for $\ell = 1, 2, 3$ respectively (the conditions there are easily checked). □_{5.4}

5.5 Remark. 1) Concerning assumption (e), e.g. if $2^{\mu_i} = \mu_i^{+5}$ and $2^\mu = \mu^{+5}$, then necessarily $\mu^{+\ell} = \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \kappa} \mu_i^{+\ell} / D)$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, 5$ and so $\bigwedge_{i < \kappa} \mathfrak{dp}_{\lambda_i}^{\ell+} = 2^{\mu_i} \Rightarrow \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda = 2^\mu$ and we can use $\mu_i = (2^\kappa)^{+i}$, $\lambda_i = \mu_i^+$, $\theta_i = \mu_i^{+5}$, $\theta = \mu^{+5}$.

So this theorem really says that the function $\lambda \mapsto \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda$ has more than the cardinality exponentiation restrictions.

2) Note that Theorem 5.4 is trivial if $\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i = 2^\mu = \lambda$, so (see [Sh:g, V]) it is natural

to assume $E =: \{D' : D' \text{ a normal filter on } \kappa\}$ is nice, but this will not be used.

3) Note that the proof of 5.16 (i.e. the case $\ell = 2$) does not depend on the longer proof of 5.6, whereas the proof of 5.15 does.

4) Recall that for an $\aleph_1$ -complete filter D say on κ and $f \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$ we define $\|f\|_D$ by $\|f\|_D = \cup \{\|g\|_D + 1 : g \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord} \text{ and } g <_D f\}$.

5) Below we shall use the assumption

(*) $\|\lambda\|_{D+A} = \lambda$ for every $A \in D^+$.

This is not strong assumption as

- (a) if SCH holds, then the only case of interests if $\langle \chi_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is increasing continuous with limit χ and $\|\langle \chi_i^+ : i < \kappa \rangle\|_D = \chi^+$ for any normal filter D on κ ; so our statements are degenerated and say nothing,
- (b) if SCH fails, there are nice filters for which this phenomenon is “popular” see [Sh:g, V, 1.13, 3.10] (see more in ?).

→ scite{10.17} undefined

5.6 Theorem. *Assume*

- (a) D is an $\aleph_1$ -complete filter on κ
- (b) $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is a sequence of regular cardinals $> (2^\kappa)^+$
- (c) $\|\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle\|_{D+A} = \lambda$ for $A \in D^+$
- (d) $\mu_i < \mathfrak{dp}_{\lambda_i}^{3+}$
- (e) $\mu = \text{tcf}(\prod \mu_i / D)$ or at least
- (e-) $\mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod \mu_i, <_D)$ and $\mu > 2^\kappa$.

Then $\mu < \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{3+}$.

Remark. Why not assume just $\|f\|_D = \lambda$ for $f =: \langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$? Note that $\text{cla}_I^\alpha(f, A)$, see below, does not make much sense.

A related theorem

5.7 Definition.

$$\mathfrak{a}_\lambda = \text{Min} \left\{ \mu : \text{there is no } \mathcal{P} \subseteq [\lambda]^\lambda \text{ of cardinality } \mu \text{ such that } A \neq B \in \mathcal{P} \Rightarrow |A \cap B| < \lambda \right\}.$$

5.8 Theorem. *Assume*

- (a) D is an $\aleph_1$ -complete filter on κ
- (b) $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is a sequence of regular cardinals $> (2^\kappa)^+$
- (c) $\|\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle\|_{D+A} = \lambda$ for $A \in D^+$
- (d) $\mu_i < \mathfrak{a}_{\lambda_i}$
- (e) $\mu = \text{tcf}(\prod \mu_i / D)$ or at least
- (e⁻) $\mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod \mu_i, <_D)$ and $\mu > 2^\kappa$.

Then $\mu < \mathfrak{a}_\lambda$.

We shall prove later.

We delay the proof of 5.6.

5.9 *Fact.* Assuming 5.6(a), for any $f \in {}^\kappa(\text{Ord} \setminus (2^\kappa)^+)$ we have: $T_D(f)$ is smaller or equal to the cardinality of $\|f\|_D$ remembering (?4) above and

→ scite{10.5} undefined

$$T_D(f) = \sup \left\{ |F| : F \subseteq \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i) \text{ and } f \neq g \in F \Rightarrow f \neq_D g \right\}.$$

Proof. Why? Let F be as in the definition of $T_D(f)$, note: $f_i \neq_D f_j$ & $f_i \leq_D f_j \Rightarrow f_i <_D f_j$. Note that $i < \kappa \Rightarrow f(i) \geq (2^\kappa)^+$, necessarily $|F| > 2^\kappa$. Now for each ordinal α let $F^{[\alpha]} =: \{f \in F : \|f\|_D = \alpha\}$. Clearly $F^{[\alpha]}$ has at most 2^κ members (otherwise $f_i \in F^{[\alpha]}$ for $i < (2^\kappa)^+$ are pairwise distinct so for some $i < j$, $f_i <_D f_j$ [Sh 111, §2] or simply use Erdős-Rado on $c(i, j) = \min\{\zeta < \kappa : f_i(\zeta) > f_j(\zeta)\}$). So $\|f\|_D \geq \sup\{\|g\|_D : g \in F\} \geq \text{otp}\{\alpha : F^{[\alpha]} \neq \emptyset\} \geq |\{F^{[\alpha]} : F^{[\alpha]} \neq \emptyset\}| \geq |F|/2^\kappa = |F|$. So $\|f\|_D \geq T_D(f)$. □_{5.9}

5.10 Definition. For $f \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$ (natural to add $0 \notin \text{Rang}(f)$) and D an $\aleph_1$ -complete filter on κ let $\prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i) = \{g : \text{Dom}(g) = \kappa, f(i) > 0 \Rightarrow g(i) < f(i) \text{ and } f(i) = 0 \Rightarrow g(i) = 0\}$ and

$$1) \text{ cla}(f, D) = \left\{ (g, A) : g \in \prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i) \text{ and } A \in D^+ \right\}$$

$$\text{cla}^\alpha(f, D) = \{(g, A) \in \text{cla}(f, D) : \|g\|_{D+A} = \alpha\}.$$

Here “cla” abbreviates “class”.

2) For $(g, A) \in \text{cla}(f, D)$ let

$$J_D(g, A) = \{B \subseteq \kappa : \text{if } B \in (D+A)^+ \text{ then } \|g\|_{(D+A)+B} > \|g\|_{D+A}\}.$$

3) We say $(g', A') \approx (g'', A'')$ if (both are in $\text{cla}(f, D)$ and) $A' = A'' \bmod D$ and $J_D(g', A') = J_D(g'', A'')$ and $g' = g'' \bmod J_D(g', A')$.

4) For I an ideal on κ disjoint to D we let

$$I * D = \{A \subseteq \kappa : \text{for some } X \in D \text{ we have } A \cap X \in I\},$$

(usually we have $\{\kappa \setminus A : A \in D\} \subseteq I$ so $I * D = I$), and let

$$\text{cla}_I(f, D) = \{(g, A) : g \in \prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i) \text{ and } A \in (I * D)^+\}.$$

5) On $\text{cla}_I(f, D)$ we define a relation $\approx_I$
 $(g_1, A_1) \approx_I (g_2, A_2)$ if:

- (a) $A_1 = A_2 \bmod D$ and
- (b) there is $B_0 \in I$ such that: if $B_0 \subseteq B \in I$ then
 $\|g_1\|_{(D+A_1)+(\kappa \setminus B)} = \|g_2\|_{(D+A_2)+(\kappa \setminus B)}$ and
 $J_{(D+A_1)+(\kappa \setminus B)}(g_1, A_1) = J_{(D+A_2)+(\kappa \setminus B)}(g_2, A_2)$.

$$6) \quad J_{D,I}(g_1, A_1) = \{A \subseteq \kappa : \text{for some } B_0 \in I \text{ if } B_0 \subseteq B \in I \\ \text{we have } A \in J_{(D+A_1)+(\kappa \setminus B_0)}(g_1, A_1)\}.$$

7) Let $\text{com}(D)$ be the maximal θ such that D is θ -complete.

5.11 *Fact.* For $f \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$ and D an $\aleph_1$ -complete filter on κ and $A \in D^+$:

- 0) If $f_1 \leq f_2$ then $\text{cla}(f_1, D) \subseteq \text{cla}(f_2, D)$ and for $g', g'' \in \prod_{i \in I}^* f_1(i)$, $A \subseteq \kappa$ we have $(g', A) \approx (g'', A)$ in $\text{cla}(f_1, D)$ iff $(g', A) \approx (g'', A)$ in $\text{cla}(f_2, D)$ (so we shall be careless about this).
- 1) $J_D(g, A)$ is an ideal on κ , $\text{com}(D)$ -complete, and normal if D is normal.
- 2) A does not belong to $J_D(g, A)$, and it includes $\{B \subseteq \kappa : B = \emptyset \bmod (D + A)\}$.
 If $B \in J_D^+(g, A)$ then $A \cap B \in D^+$ and $\|g\|_{D+(A \cap B)} = \|g\|_{D+A}$.
- 3) $\approx$ is an equivalence relation on $\text{cla}(f, D)$, similarly $\approx_I$ on $\text{cla}_I(f, D)$.
- 4) Assume

$$(i) \quad (g, A) \in \text{cla}^\alpha(f, D), g' \in \prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i) \text{ and}$$

- (ii) (a) $g' = g \bmod (D + A)$ or
- (b) for some $B \in J_D(g, A)$ we have $\alpha \in B \Rightarrow g'(\alpha) > \|g\|_D$
 (or just $\|g\|_{D+A} < \|g'\|_{D+B}$) and
 $g' \upharpoonright (\kappa \setminus B) = g \upharpoonright (\kappa \setminus B) \bmod D$.

Then $(g', A) \approx (g, A)$.

5) For each α , in $\text{cla}^\alpha(f, D)/\approx$ there are at most 2^κ classes.

6) For $f \in {}^\kappa(\text{Ord})$, in $\text{cla}(f, D)/\approx$ there are at most $2^\kappa + \sup_{A \in D^+} \|f\|_{D+A}$ classes.

Proof. 0) Easy.

1) Straight (e.g. ideal as for $B \subseteq \kappa$ we have

$$\|g\|_D = \text{Min}\{\|g\|_{D+A}, \|g\|_{D+(\kappa-A)}\}, \text{ where we stipulate } \|g\|_{\mathcal{P}(\kappa)} = \infty \text{ see [Sh 71]}.$$

2) Check.

3) Check.

4) Check.

5) We can work also in $\text{cla}^\alpha(f+1, D)$ (this change gives more elements and by (0) it preserves $\approx$). Assume α is a counterexample (note that " $\leq 2^{2^\kappa}$ " is totally immediate). Let χ be large enough; choose $N \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in, <_\chi^*)$ of cardinality 2^κ such that $\{f, D, \kappa, \alpha\} \in N$ and ${}^\kappa N \subseteq N$. So necessarily there is $(g, A) \in \text{cla}^\alpha(f, D)$ such that $(g, A) / \approx \notin N$, by the definition of cla^α , clearly $\|g\|_D + A = \alpha$. Let $B =: \{i < \kappa : g(i) \notin N\}$.

Case 1: $B \in J_D(g, A)$.

Let $g' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} (f(i) + 1)$ be defined by: $g'(i) = g(i)$ if $i \in \kappa \setminus B$ and $g'(i) = f(i)$ if $i \in B$. By part (4) we have $(g', A) \approx (g, A)$ and by the choice of N we have $(g', A) \in N$ as $A \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \subseteq N$, $g' \in N$ (as $\text{Rang}(g') \subseteq N$ & ${}^\kappa N \subseteq N$). So as $(\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in, <_\chi^*) \models (\exists x \in \text{cla}^\alpha(f, A))(x \approx (g', A))$ there is $(g'', A) \in N$ such that $(g'', A) \approx (g, A)$ as required.

Case 2: $B \notin J_D(g, A)$.

Let $g' \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$ be: $g'(i) = \text{Min}(N \cap (f(i) + 1) \setminus g(i)) \leq f(i)$ if $i \in B$, $g'(i) = g(i)$ if $i \notin B$ (note: $f(i) \in N$, $g(i) < f(i)$ so g' is well defined).

Clearly $g' \in N$, (as $\text{Rang}(g') \subseteq N$ and ${}^\kappa N \subseteq N$), and

$$(\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in, <_\chi^*) \models (\exists x)(x \in \prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i) \wedge (\forall i \in \kappa \setminus B)(x(i) = g'(i)) \wedge (\forall i \in B)(x(i) < g'(i)) \wedge \|x\|_{D+(A \cap B)} = \alpha)$$

(why? because $x = g$ is like that, last equality as $B \notin J_D(g, A)$). So there is such x in N , call it g'' . So $g'' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} (f(i) + 1)$ and $\|g''\|_{D+(A \cap B)} = \alpha$ and for

$i \in B$, $g''(i) \in g'(i) \cap N$ hence $g''(i) < g(i)$ by the definition of $g'(i)$.

So $g'' < g \bmod D + (A \cap B)$, but this contradicts $\|g''\|_{D+(A \cap B)} = \alpha = \|g\|_{D+(A \cap B)}$, the last equality as $B \notin J_D(g, A)$.

6) Immediate from (5). □_{5.11}

5.12 Fact. Assume $f \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$ and D an $\aleph_1$ -complete filter on κ and I an $\text{com}(D)$ -complete ideal on κ .

1) If $(g, A) \in \text{cla}_I(f, D)$ then $J_{D,I}(g, A)$ is an ideal on κ , which is $\text{com}(D)$ -complete and normal if D, I are normal.

If $B \in (J_{D,I}(g, A))^+$ then $\|g\|_{D+(A \cap B)} = \|g\|_{D+A}$, and $(D + (A \cap B)) \cap I = \emptyset$.

2) $\approx_I$ is an equivalence relation on $\text{cla}(f, D)$.

3) If $(g, A) \in \text{cla}(f, D)$ and $g' \in \prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i)$ and $g' = g \bmod J_{D,I}(g, A)$ then for some A' we have $(g', A') \approx_I (g, A)$ so $(g', A') \in \text{cla}(f, D)$ and $\|g'\|_{D+A'} = \|g\|_{D+A'}$ (in fact $A' = \{i \in A : g'(i) = g(i)\}$ is O.K.).

Proof. Easy.

5.13 *Fact.* Let κ, f, D be as in 5.12.

1) If $f_\zeta \in {}^\kappa\text{Ord}$, for $\zeta \leq \delta$, $\text{cf}(\delta) > \kappa$ and for each i the sequence $\langle f_\zeta(i) : \zeta \leq \delta \rangle$ is increasing continuous then $\|f_\delta\|_D = \sup_{\zeta < \delta} \|f_\zeta\|_D$.

2) If $\delta = \|f\|_D$, $\text{cf}(\delta) > 2^\kappa$ then $\{i : \text{cf}(f(i)) \leq 2^\kappa\} \in J_D(f, \kappa)$.

3) If $\|f\|_D = \delta$, $A \in J_D^+(f, \kappa)$ then $\prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i)/(D + A)$ is not $(\text{cf}(\delta))^+$ -directed.

4) If $\|f\|_D = \delta$ and $A \in J_D^+(f, \kappa)$ then $\text{cf}(\delta) \leq \text{cf}(\prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i)/(D + A))$.

5) If $\|f\|_D = \delta$ and $A \subseteq \kappa$, $(\forall i \in A) \text{cf}(f(i)) > \kappa$ and $\max \text{pcf}\{f(i) : i \in A\} < \text{cf}(\delta)$

(or just $\text{cf}(\delta) > \max\{\text{cf} \prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i)/D' : D' \text{ an ultrafilter extending } D + A\}$) then

$A \in J_D(f, \kappa)$.

6) If $\|f\|_D = \delta$, $\text{cf}(\delta) > 2^\kappa$, then $\prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i)/J_D(f, \kappa)$ is $\text{cf}(\delta)$ -directed.

7) If $\|f\|_D = \delta$, $\text{cf}(\delta) > 2^\kappa$, then for some $A \in J_D^+(f, \kappa)$ we have

$\prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i)/J_D(f, \kappa) + (\kappa \setminus A)$ has true cofinality $\text{cf}(\delta)$.

8) Assume $\|f\|_D = \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > 2^\kappa$.

Then $(\forall A \in D^+)(\|f\|_{D+A} = \lambda)$ implies $\text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i)/D) = \lambda$.

9) If $\|f\|_D = \delta$, $\text{cf}(\delta) > 2^\kappa$ then $\text{tcf} \prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i)/J_D(f, \kappa) = \text{cf}(\delta)$.

Proof. 1) Let $g <_D f_\delta$, so $A = \{i < \kappa : g(i) < f_\delta(i)\} \in D$, now for each $i \in A$ we have $g(i) < f_\delta(i) \Rightarrow (\exists \alpha < \delta)(g(i) < f_\alpha(i)) \Rightarrow$ there is $\alpha_i < \delta$ such that $(\forall \alpha)[\alpha_i \leq \alpha < \delta \Rightarrow g(i) < f_\alpha(i)]$. Hence $\alpha(*) =: \sup\{\alpha_i : i \in A\} < \delta$ as $\text{cf}(\delta) > \kappa$, so $g <_D f_{\alpha(*)}$ hence $\|g\|_D < \|f_{\alpha(*)}\|_D$; this suffices for one inequality, the other is trivial.

2) Let $A = \{i : \text{cf}(i) \leq 2^\kappa\}$, and assume toward contradiction that $A \in J_D^+(f, \kappa)$. For each $i \in A$ let $C_i \subseteq f(i)$ be unbounded of order type $\text{cf}(f(i)) \leq 2^\kappa$.

Let $F = \{g \in \prod_{i < \kappa}^* (f(i) + 1) : \text{if } i \in A \text{ then } g(i) \in C_i, \text{ if } i \in \kappa \setminus A \text{ then } g(i) = f(i)\}$.

So $|F| \leq 2^\kappa$ and:

- (*) if $g <_{D+A} f$ then for some $g' \in F$, $g <_{D+A} g'$
hence $\delta = \|f\|_{D+A} = \sup\{\|g\|_{D+A} : g \in F\}$ but the supremum is on $\leq |F| < \text{cf}(\delta)$ ordinals each $< \delta$ because $g' \in F \Rightarrow g' <_{D+A} f$ as $\|f\|_D = \delta \Rightarrow f \neq_D 0_\kappa$, contradiction to $\text{cf}(\delta) > 2^\kappa$.

3) Assume this fails, so $\|f\|_D = \delta$, $A \in J_D^+(f, \kappa)$ and $\prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i)/(D + A)$ is $(\text{cf}(\delta))^+$ -

directed. Let $C \subseteq \delta$ be unbounded of order type $\text{cf}(\delta)$; as $\|f\|_{D+A} = \delta$ (because $A \in J_D^+(f, \kappa)$) for each $\alpha \in C$ there is $f_\alpha <_{D+A} f$ such that $\|f_\alpha\|_{D+A} \geq \alpha$ (even

$= \alpha$ by the definition of $\| - \|_{D+A}$. As $\prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i)/(D+A)$ is $(\text{cf}(\delta))^+$ -directed there

is $f' <_{D+A} f$ such that $\alpha \in C \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_{D+A} f'$. By the first inequality $\|f'_{D+A}\| < \|f\|_{D+A} = \delta$, and by the second inequality $\alpha \in C \Rightarrow \alpha \leq \|f_\alpha\|_{D+A} \leq \|f'\|_{D+A}$ hence $\delta = \sup(C) \leq \|f'\|_{D+A}$, a contradiction.

4) Same proof as part (2).

5) By part (4) and [Sh:g, Ch.II,3.1].

6) Follows.

7) If not, by part (2) without loss of generality $\forall i[\text{cf}(f(i)) > 2^\kappa]$; let $C \subseteq \delta$ be unbounded, $\text{otp}(C) = \text{cf}(\delta)$. For each $\alpha \in C$ and $A \in J_D^+(f, \kappa)$ choose $f_{\alpha,A} <_D f$ such that $\|f_{\alpha,A}\|_{D+A} = \alpha$. Let f_α be $f_\alpha(i) = \sup\{f_{\alpha,A}(i) : A \in J_D^+(f, \kappa)\}$. As

$(\prod_{i < \kappa}^* f_\alpha(i), <_{J_D(f, \kappa)})$ is $\text{cf}(\delta)$ -directed (see part (8)), by the assumption toward con-

tradiction and the pcf theorem we have $\prod_{i < \kappa}^* f(i)/J_D(f, \kappa)$ is $(\text{cf}(\delta))^+$ -directed. Hence

we can find $f^* < f$ such that $\alpha \in C \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_{J_D(f, \kappa)} f^*$. Let $\beta = \sup\{\|f^*\|_{D+B} : B \in J_D^+(f, A)\}$, it is $< \delta$ as $\text{cf}(\delta) > 2^\kappa$; hence there is $\alpha, \beta < \alpha \in C$, so by the choice of f^* we have $f_\alpha <_{J_D(f, \kappa)} f^*$, and let $A = \{i < \kappa : f_\alpha(i) < f^*(i)\}$ so $A \in J_D^+(f, \kappa)$, so $f_{\alpha,A} \leq f_\alpha <_{D+A} f^*$ hence $\alpha \leq \|f_{\alpha,A}\|_{D+A} \leq \|f_\alpha\|_{D+A} \leq \|f^*\|_{D+A} \leq \beta$ contradicting the choice of α .

8) For every $\alpha < \lambda$ we can choose $f_\alpha <_D f$ such that $\|f_\alpha\|_D = \alpha$. Let $a_\alpha = \{\|f_\alpha\|_{D+A} : A \in D^+\}$, as $A \in D^+ \Rightarrow \alpha \leq \|f_\alpha\|_D \leq \|f_\alpha\|_{D+A} < \|f\|_{D+A} = \lambda$, clearly a_α is a subset of $\lambda \setminus \alpha$, and its cardinality is $\leq 2^\kappa < \lambda$. So we can find an unbounded $E \subseteq \lambda$ such that $\alpha < \beta \in E \Rightarrow \sup(a_\alpha) < \beta$. So if $\alpha < \beta, \alpha \in E, \beta \in E$, let $A = \{i < \kappa : f_\alpha(i) \geq f_\beta(i)\}$, and if $A \in D^+$, then $\|f_\beta\|_{D+A} \leq \|f_\alpha\|_{D+A} \leq \sup a_\alpha < \beta$, contradiction. Hence $A = \emptyset \bmod D$ that is $f_\alpha <_D f_\beta$. Also if $g <_D f$, then $a = \{\|g\|_{D+A} : A \in D^+\}$ is again a subset of λ of cardinality $\leq 2^\kappa$ hence for some $\beta < \lambda$, $\sup(a) < \beta$, so as above $g <_D f_\beta$. Together $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha \in E \rangle$ exemplify $\lambda = \text{tcf}(\prod f(i), <_D)$.

9) Similar proof (to part (8)), using parts (6), (7). □_{5.13}

5.14 Remark. We think Claims 5.11, 5.12, 5.13 (and Definition 5.10) can be applied to the problems from [Sh 497].

Proof of 5.6. Fix $f \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}$ as $f(i) = \lambda_i$ and let $\approx, \approx_I$ be as in Definition 5.10.

For each $i < \kappa$ let $\bar{X}^i = \langle X_\alpha^i : \alpha < \mu_i \rangle$ be a sequence of members of $[\lambda_i]^{\lambda_i}$ such that

$$\alpha < \beta < \mu_i \Rightarrow X_\alpha^i \setminus X_\beta^i \in J_{\lambda_i}^{bd} \ \& \ X_\beta^i \setminus X_\alpha^i \notin J_{\lambda_i}^{bd}.$$

(it exists by assumption (d)).

Let $\bar{g}^* = \langle g_\zeta^* : \zeta < \mu \rangle$ be a $<_D$ -increasing sequence of members of $\prod_{i < \kappa} \mu_i$, it exists

by assumption (e) or (e)⁻.

Let $I =: \{B \subseteq \kappa : \text{if } B \in D^+ \text{ then } \|f\|_{D+B} > \lambda\}$, it is a $\text{com}(D)$ -complete ideal on κ disjoint to D , i.e., $I = J_D(\bar{\lambda}, \kappa) \supseteq \{\kappa \setminus A : A \in D\}$, and $\approx_I, \approx$ are equal by assumption (c). For any sequence $\bar{X} = \langle X_i : i < \kappa \rangle \in \prod_{i < \kappa} [\lambda_i]^{\lambda_i}$, let

$$Y[\bar{X}] =: \left\{ \|h\|_{D+A} : h \in \prod_{i < \kappa} X_i \text{ and } A \in I^+ \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}] =: \left\{ (h, A)/\approx : h \in \prod_{i < \kappa} X_i \text{ and } (h, A) \in \text{cla}_I^\alpha(\bar{\lambda}, D) \right. \\ \left. \text{for some } \alpha < \lambda \right\}$$

Note: $Y[\bar{X}] \subseteq \lambda$ and $\mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}] \subseteq \mathcal{Y}^* =: \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \text{cla}^\alpha(\bar{\lambda}, D)/\approx$.

Note that by 5.11(6)

$$\boxtimes \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \text{cla}^\alpha(f, D)/\approx \text{ has cardinality } \leq \lambda.$$

(*)₀ for $\bar{X} \in \prod_{i < \kappa} [\lambda_i]^{\lambda_i}$, the mapping $(g, A)/\approx_I \mapsto \|g\|_{D+A}$ is from $\mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}]$ onto

$Y[\bar{X}]$ with every $\alpha \in Y[\bar{X}]$ having at most 2^κ preimages
[why? by 5.11(5)]

(*)₁ if $\bar{X} \in \prod_{i < \kappa} [\lambda_i]^{\lambda_i}$ then $\mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}]$ has cardinality λ .

[why? by the definition of $\| - \|_D$ for every $\alpha < \lambda$ for some $g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i/D$ we

have $\|g\|_D = \alpha$; as $\sup(X_i) = \lambda_i > g(i)$ we can find $g' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} (X_i \setminus g(i))$ such

that $g \leq g' < \langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$, so $\alpha = \|g\|_D \leq \|g'\|_D < \|\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle\|_D = \lambda$.
Clearly for some α' and $A, (g', A) \in \text{cla}^{\alpha'}(f, A)$, so $A \in I^+ \subseteq D^+$, and
 $\alpha \leq \alpha' = \|g'\|_{D+A} < \|f\|_{D+A} = \lambda$ (as $A \in I^+$). So $\alpha' \in Y[\bar{X}]$ hence
 $Y[\bar{X}] \not\subseteq \alpha$; as $\alpha < \lambda$ was arbitrary, $Y[\bar{X}]$ has cardinality $\geq \lambda$, by $\boxtimes$ equality
holds hence (by (*)₀) also $\mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}]$ has cardinality λ .]

(*)₂ if $\bar{X}', \bar{X}'' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} [\lambda_i]^{\lambda_i}$, and

$\{i < \kappa : X'_i \subseteq X''_i \text{ mod } J_{\lambda_i}^{bd}\} \in D$ then

(a) $Y[\bar{X}'] \subseteq Y[\bar{X}''] \text{ mod } J_\lambda^{bd}$

(b) $\mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}'] \setminus \mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}'']$ has cardinality $< \lambda$

[why? define $g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$ by $g(i) = \sup(X'_i \setminus X''_i)$ if

$i \in A^* =: \{i < \kappa : X'_i \subseteq X''_i \text{ mod } J_{\lambda_i}^{bd}\}$ and $g(i) = 0$ otherwise. Let $\alpha(*) = \sup\{\|g\|_{D+A} + 1 : A \in I^+\}$, as λ is regular
 $> 2^\kappa$ clearly $\alpha(*) < \lambda$ (see assumption (c) or definition of I). Assume $\beta \in Y[\bar{X}'] \setminus \alpha(*)$ and we shall prove that $\beta \in Y[\bar{X}'']$, moreover,
 $\mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}'] \cap (\text{cla}^\beta(\bar{X}, D)/\approx_I) \subseteq \mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}'']$, this clearly suffices for both
clauses. We can find $f^* \in \prod_{i < \kappa} (X'_i \cap X''_i) \cup \{0\}$ such that $\|f^*\|_D > \beta$.

So let a member of $\mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}'] \cap (\text{cla}^\beta(\bar{\lambda}, D)/\approx)$ have the form $(h, A)/\approx_I$, where $A \in I^+$, $h \in \prod_{i < \kappa} X'_i$ and $\beta = \|h\|_{D+A}$ and let

$A_1 =: \{i < \kappa : h(i) \leq g(i)\}$. We know

$\beta = \|h\|_{D+A} = \text{Min}\{\|h\|_{D+(A \cap A_1)}, \|h\|_{D+(A \setminus A_1)}\}$ (if $A \cap A_1 = \emptyset \bmod D$, then $\|h\|_{D+A \cap A_1}$ can be considered ∞).

If $\beta = \|h\|_{D+(A \cap A_1)}$ then note $h \leq_{D+(A \cap A_1)} g$ hence

$\beta = \|h\|_{D+(A \cap A_1)} \leq \|g\|_{D+(A \cap A_1)} < \alpha(*)$, contradiction to an assumption on β . So $\beta = \|h\|_{D+(A \setminus A_1)}$ and $A \cap A_1 \in J_{D,I}(h, A)$, and

define $h' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)$ by: $h'(i)$ is $h(i)$ if $i \in A \setminus A_1$ and $h'(i)$ is $f^*(i)$ if $i \in$

$\kappa \setminus (A \setminus A_1)$. So $h' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)$ and $h' =_{D+(A \setminus A_1)} h$ hence $\|h'\|_{D+(A \setminus A_1)} =$

$\|h\|_{D+(A \setminus A_1)} = \beta$, and clearly $\beta = \|h'\|_{D+(A \setminus A_1)} \in Y[\bar{X}'']$, as required for clause (a), moreover $(h, A) \approx (h', A)$ so $(h', A)/\approx \in \mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}'']$ as required for clause (b).]

(*)₃ If $\bar{X}', \bar{X}'' \in \prod_{i < \lambda} [\lambda_i]^{\lambda_i}$ and

$\{i < \kappa : X''_i \not\subseteq X'_i \bmod J_\lambda^{bd}\} \in D$ then

$\mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}''] \setminus \mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}']$ has cardinality λ .

[why? let $\alpha < \lambda$, it is enough to find $\beta \in [\alpha, \lambda]$ such that

$$(\mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}''] \setminus \mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}']) \cap (\text{cla}^\beta(f, D)/\approx) \neq \emptyset.$$

We can find $g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$ such that $\|g\|_D = \alpha$. Define $g' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} X''_i$ by: $g'(i)$ is

$\text{Min}(X''_i \setminus X'_i \setminus g(i))$ when well defined, $\text{Min}(X''_i)$ otherwise. By assumption

$g \leq_D g'$ and, of course, $g' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} X''_i \subseteq \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$, so $\|g'\|_D \geq \alpha$. So

$((g', \kappa)/\approx) \in \mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}'']$ but trivially $((g', \kappa)/\approx) \notin \mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}']$, so we are done].

Together (*)₀ – (*)₃ give that $\langle \mathcal{Y}[\langle X_{g_\zeta^*(i)}^i \rangle : i < \kappa] : \zeta < \mu \rangle$ is a sequence of subsets of $\mathcal{Y}^*$ of length μ (see (*)₁), $|\mathcal{Y}^*| = \lambda$, which is increasing modulo $[\mathcal{Y}^*]^{<\lambda}$ (by (*)₂), and in fact, strictly increasing (by (*)₃). So modulo changing names we have finished. $\square_{5.6}$

Proof of 5.8. Similar to the proof of 5.6

5.15 Theorem. *Assume*

- (a) D an $\aleph_1$ -complete filter on κ
- (b) $\bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is a sequence of regular cardinals $> 2^\kappa$
- (c) $\lambda = \|\bar{\lambda}\|_{D+A}$ for $A \in D^+$
- (d) $\mu_i < \mathfrak{dp}_{\lambda_i}^{1+}$
- (e) $\mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} \mu_i, <_D)$.

Then $\mu < \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{1+}$.

Proof. Let $\text{Club}(\lambda) = \{C : C \text{ a club of } \lambda\}$ so $\text{Club}(\lambda) \subseteq [\lambda]^\lambda$ for $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > \aleph_0$.

For any sequence $\bar{C} \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \text{Club}(\lambda_i)$ let $\mathcal{C}(\bar{C})$ be the set $\text{acc}(\text{cl}(Y(\bar{C})))$ where $Y[\bar{C}] =: \{\|g\|_D : g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} C_i\} (\subseteq \lambda)$; i.e. $\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}) = \{\delta < \lambda : \delta = \sup(\delta \cap Y[\bar{C}])\}$.

Clearly

(*)₁ for $\bar{C} \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \text{Club}(\lambda_i)$ we have $\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}) \in \text{Club}(\lambda)$

[the question is why it is unbounded, and this holds as $\|\bar{\lambda}\|_D = \lambda$ by its definition]

(*)₂ if $\bar{C}', \bar{C}'' \in \prod_{i < \lambda} \text{Club}(\lambda_i)$, $g^* \in \Pi \lambda_i$ and $C_i'' = C_i' \setminus g^*(i)$ then

$$\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}') = \mathcal{C}(\bar{C}'') \text{ mod } J_\lambda^{bd}$$

[why? let $\alpha(*) = \sup\{\|g^*\|_{D+A} : A \in D^+ \text{ and } \|g^*\|_{D+A} < \lambda\} + 1$, so as $2^\kappa < \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda)$ clearly $\alpha(*) < \lambda$. We shall show $\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}') \setminus \alpha(*) = \mathcal{C}(\bar{C}'') \setminus \alpha(*)$; for this it suffices to prove $Y(\bar{C}') \setminus \alpha(*) = Y(\bar{C}'') \setminus \alpha(*)$. If $\alpha \in Y(\bar{C}') \setminus \alpha(*)$ let $\alpha = \|h\|_D$ where $h \in \prod_i C_i'$, and let $A = \{i < \kappa : h(i) < g^*(i)\}$, so if

$A \in (J_D(\bar{\lambda}, \kappa))^+$ then $\alpha \leq \|h\|_{D+A} < \lambda$ and $\|h\|_{D+A} \leq \|g^*\|_{D+A} < \alpha(*)$ but $\alpha \geq \alpha(*)$ contradiction. So $A \in J_D(\bar{\lambda}, \kappa)$ hence $A \notin D^+$ by clause (c), so $g^* \leq_D h$. Now clearly there is $h' =_D h$ with $h' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} C_i''$, so $\alpha = \|h\|_D = \|h'\|_D \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{C}'')$. The other inclusion is easier.]

(*)₃ if $\bar{C}', \bar{C}'' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \text{Club}(\lambda_i)$ and $\{i < \kappa : C_i'' \subseteq \text{acc}(C_i')\} \in D$ then

$$\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}'') \subseteq \text{acc}(\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}'))$$

[why? let $\beta \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{C}'')$ but $\beta \notin \text{acc}(\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}'))$ and we shall get a contradiction. Clearly $\beta > \sup(\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}') \cap \beta)$ (as $\beta \notin \text{acc}(\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}'))$). As $\mathcal{C}[\bar{C}'']$ is $\text{acc}(\text{cl} Y[\bar{C}''])$, clearly there is $\alpha \in Y[\bar{C}'']$ such that $\beta > \alpha > \sup(\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}') \cap \beta) \geq \sup(Y(\bar{C}') \cap \beta)$, but $Y[\bar{C}''] = \{\|g\|_D : g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} C_i''\}$, so there is $g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} C_i''$ such that $\|g\|_D = \alpha$. As $\{i : C_i'' \subseteq \text{acc}(C_i')\} \in D$, clearly

$$B =: \{i < \kappa : g(i) \in \text{acc}(C_i')\} \in D.$$

So if $h \in \prod_{i < \lambda} \lambda_i$, $h <_D g$ then we can find $h' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} C_i'$ such that $h <_D h' <_D g$

(just $h'(i) = \text{Min}(C_i' \setminus (h(i) + 1))$ noting $B \in D$) hence

$\alpha = \|g\|_D = \sup\{\|h\|_D : h(i) \in g(i) \cap C_i' \text{ when } i \in B, h(i) = \text{Min}(C_i') \text{ otherwise}\}$ and in this set there is no last element and it is included in $Y(\bar{C}')$, so necessarily $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{C}')$, contradicting the choice of $\alpha : \beta > \alpha > \sup(\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}') \cap \beta)$.]

(*)₄ if $\bar{C}', \bar{C}'' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \text{Club}(\lambda_i)$ and $\{i : C_i'' \subseteq \text{acc}(C_i') \text{ mod } J_{\lambda_i}^{bd}\} \in D$ then

$$\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}'') \subseteq \text{acc}(\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}')) \text{ mod } J_\lambda^{bd}$$

[why? by $(*)_2 + (*)_3$, i.e., define C_i''' to be $C_i'' \setminus g(i)$ where $g(i) =: \sup(C_i'' \setminus \text{acc}(C_i')) + 1$ when $C_i'' \subseteq \text{acc}(C_i')$ and the empty set otherwise. Now by $(*)_2$ we know $\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}'') = \mathcal{C}(\bar{C}''') \bmod J_\lambda^{bd}$ and by $(*)_3$ we know $\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}''') \subseteq \text{acc}(\mathcal{C}(\bar{C}'))$.]

Now we can prove the conclusion of 5.15. Let $\langle C_\alpha^i : \alpha < \mu_i \rangle$ witness $\mu_i < \mathfrak{dp}_{\lambda_i}^{1+}$ and $\langle g_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ witness $\mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i, <_D)$. Let $C_\alpha =: \mathcal{C}(\langle C_{g_\alpha(i)}^i : i < \kappa \rangle)$ for $\alpha < \mu$. So $\langle C_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ witness $\mu < \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{1+}$. $\square_{5.15}$

5.16 Theorem. *Assume*

- (a) κ is regular uncountable
- (b) $\bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is a sequence of regular cardinals $> \kappa$
- (c) D is a normal filter on κ (or just $\aleph_1$ -complete)
- (d) $\lambda = \|\bar{\lambda}\|_D = \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i / D), \lambda$ regular
- (e) $\mu_i < \mathfrak{dp}_{\lambda_i}^{2+}$
- (f) $\mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} \mu_i, <_D)$.

Then $\mu < \mathfrak{dp}_\lambda^{2+}$.

Proof. Let $\langle f_\alpha^i : \alpha < \mu_i \rangle$ exemplify $\mu_i < \mathfrak{dp}_{\lambda_i}^{+2}$, let $\langle g_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ exemplify $\mu < \text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} \mu_i, <_D)$, and let $\langle h_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda \rangle$ exemplify $\lambda = \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i, <_D)$.

Now for each $\alpha < \mu$ we define $f_\alpha \in {}^\lambda \lambda$ as follows:

$$f_\alpha(\zeta) = \|\langle f_{g_\alpha(i)}^i(h_\zeta(i)) : i < \kappa \rangle\|_D.$$

Clearly $f_\alpha(\zeta)$ is an ordinal and as $f_{g_\alpha(i)}^i \in {}^{(\lambda_i)} \lambda_i$ clearly $\langle f_{g_\alpha(i)}^i(h_\zeta(i)) : i < \kappa \rangle <_D \langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ hence $f_\alpha(\zeta) < \|\bar{\lambda}\|_D = \lambda$, so really $f_\alpha(\zeta) < \lambda$, so

$$(*)_1 \quad f_\alpha \in {}^\lambda \lambda.$$

The main point is to prove $\beta < \alpha < \mu \Rightarrow f_\beta <_{J_\lambda^{bd}} f_\alpha$.

Suppose $\beta < \alpha < \mu$, then $g_\beta <_D g_\alpha$ hence $A =: \{i < \kappa : g_\beta(i) < g_\alpha(i)\} \in D$ so $i \in A \Rightarrow f_{g_\beta(i)}^i <_{J_{\lambda_i}^{bd}} f_{g_\alpha(i)}^i$. We can define $h \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$ by:

$h(i)$ is $\sup\{\zeta + 1 : f_{g_\beta(i)}^i(\zeta) \geq f_{g_\alpha(i)}^i(\zeta)\}$ if $i \in A$ and $h(i)$ is zero otherwise.

But $\langle h_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda \rangle$ is $<_D$ -increasing cofinal in $(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i, <_D)$ hence there is $\zeta(*) < \lambda$

such that $h <_D h_{\zeta(*)}$.

So it suffices to prove:

$$\zeta(*) \leq \zeta < \lambda \Rightarrow f_\beta(\zeta) < f_\alpha(\zeta).$$

So let $\zeta \in [\zeta(*), \lambda)$, so

$$B =: \{i < \kappa : h(i) < h_{\zeta(*)}(i) \leq h_{\zeta}(i) \text{ and } i \in A\}$$

belongs to D and by the definition of A and B and h we have

$$i \in B \Rightarrow f_{g_{\beta}(i)}^i(h_{\zeta}(i)) < f_{g_{\alpha}(i)}^i(h_{\zeta}(i)).$$

So

$$\langle f_{g_{\beta}(i)}^i(h_{\zeta}(i)) : i < \kappa \rangle <_D \langle f_{g_{\alpha}(i)}^i(h_{\zeta}(i)) : i < \kappa \rangle$$

hence (by the definition of $\| - \|_D$)

$$\|\langle f_{g_{\beta}(i)}^i(h_{\zeta}(i)) : i < \kappa \rangle\|_D < \|\langle f_{g_{\alpha}(i)}^i(h_{\zeta}(i)) : i < \kappa \rangle\|_D$$

which means

$$f_{\beta}(\zeta) < f_{\alpha}(\zeta).$$

As this holds for every $\zeta \in [\zeta(*), \lambda)$ clearly

$$f_{\beta} <_{J_{\lambda}^{bd}} f_{\alpha}.$$

So $\langle f_{\alpha} : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ is $<_{J_{\lambda}^{bd}}$ -increasing, so we have finished. $\square_{5.16}$

5.17 Discussion: Now assumption (c) in 5.15 (and in 5.6) is not so serious: once we quote [Sh:g, V] (to satisfy the assumption in the usual case we are given $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda)$, $\mu < \lambda \leq \mu^{\kappa}$, $\text{cf}(\mu) = \kappa$, $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(|\alpha|^{\kappa} < \mu)$) and we like to find $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$, and normal D such that $\|\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle\|_{D+A} = \lambda$. E.g. [Sh:g, Ch.V]) if SCH fails above $2^{2^{\theta}}$, θ regular uncountable, D a normal filter on θ , $\|f\|_D \geq \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > 2^{2^{\theta}}$, (so if $\mathcal{E}$ = family of normal filters on θ , so $\mathcal{E}$ is nice and $\text{rk}_E^3(f) \geq \|f\|_D \geq \lambda$), so g_{κ} from [Sh:g, Ch.V, 3.10, p.244] is as required.

Still we may note

5.18 Fact. Assume

- (a) D an $\aleph_1$ -complete filter on κ
- (b) $f^* \in {}^{\kappa}\text{Ord}$ and $\text{cf}(f^*(i)) > 2^{\kappa}$ for $i < \kappa$.

Then for any $\bar{C} = \langle C_i : i < \kappa \rangle$, C_i a club of $f^*(i)$ and $\alpha < \|f^*\|_D$ we can find $f \in \prod_{i < \kappa} C_i$ such that:

- (α) $A \in (J_D(f^*, \kappa))^+ \Rightarrow \alpha < \|f\|_{D+A} = \|f\|_D < \|f^*\|_D$
- (β) $A \in J_D(f^*, \kappa) \cap D^+ \Rightarrow \|f\|_{D+A} \geq \|f^*\|_D$

Proof. We choose by induction on $\zeta \leq \kappa^+$, a function f_{ζ} and $\langle f_{\zeta, A} : A \in (J_D(f^*, \kappa))^+ \rangle$ such that:

- (a) $f_{\zeta} \in \prod_{i < \kappa} C_i$

- (b) $\varepsilon < \zeta \Rightarrow \bigwedge_i f_\varepsilon(i) < f_\zeta(i)$
- (c) for ζ limit $f_\zeta(i) = \sup_{\varepsilon < \zeta} f_\varepsilon(i)$
- (d) for $A \in (J_D(f^*, A))^+$, letting $\alpha_{\zeta, A} =: \|f_\zeta\|_{D+A}$ we have
 $f_{\zeta, A} \in \prod_{i < \kappa} f^*(i)$, $\|f_{\zeta, A}\|_D > \alpha_{\zeta, A}$ and
 $f_{\zeta, A}(i) \geq f_\zeta(i)$ for $i < \kappa$
- (e) $f_{\zeta, A}(i) < f_{\zeta+1}(i)$ for $i < \kappa$, $A \in (J_D(f^*, A))^+$
- (f) $\|f_0\|_D \geq \alpha$ and
 $A \in J_D(f^*, \kappa) \Rightarrow \|f_0\|_{D+A} \geq \|f^*\|_D$.

There is no problem to carry the definition: for defining f_0 for each $A \in J_D(f^*, \kappa)$ choose $g_A <_{D+A} f^*$ such that $\|g_A\|_{D+A} \geq \|f\|_D$ (possible as $\|f^*\|_{D+A} > \|f^*\|_D$ by the assumption on A). Let $g^* < f^*$ be such that $\|g^*\|_D \geq \alpha$, (possible as $\alpha < \|f^*\|_D$) and let $f_0 \in \prod_{i < \kappa} f^*(i)$ be defined by $f_0(i) = \text{Min}(C_i \setminus \sup\{g^*(i), g_A(i) : A \in (J_D(f^*, \kappa))^+\})$. For ζ limit there is no problem to define f_ζ ; and also for ζ successor. If f_ζ is defined, we should choose $f_{\zeta, A}$. For clause (d) note that $\|f^*\|_{D+A} = \|f^*\|_D$ as $A \in (J_D(f^*, A))^+$ and use the definition of $\|f\|_D$. We use, of course, $\bigwedge_i \text{cf}(f^*(i)) > 2^\kappa$.

Now f_{κ^+} is as required. Note: $f <_D f_{\kappa^+} \Rightarrow \bigvee_{\zeta < \kappa^+} f <_D f_\zeta$, and for
 $A \in (J_D(f^*, \kappa))^+$, $\|f_{\kappa^+}\|_{D+A} = \sup_{\zeta < \kappa^+} \|f_\zeta\|_{D+A} = \sup_{\zeta < \kappa^+} \alpha_{\zeta, A} \leq \sup_{\zeta < \kappa^+} \|f_{\zeta+1}\|_D = \|f_{\kappa^+}\|_D$.

□_{5.18}

5.19 Conclusion. 1) In 5.15 we can weaken assumption (c) to

$$(1) (c)^- \text{ } \|\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle\|_D = \lambda.$$

2) In 5.6 we can weaken assumption (c) to (c)a⁻.

Proof. 1) In the proof of 5.15, choose $g^{**} \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$ satisfying (exists by 5.18):

$$(*)_0 \ A \in J_D(\bar{\lambda}, \kappa) \cap D^+ \Rightarrow \|g^{**}\|_{D+A} \geq \lambda \text{ (which is } \|\bar{\lambda}\|_D).$$

We redefine $Y[\bar{C}]$ as $\{\|g\|_D : g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} C_i \text{ but } g(i) \geq g^{**}(i) \text{ for } i < \kappa\}$. The only change is during the proof of $(*)_2$ there. Now if $\alpha \in Y[\bar{C}'] \setminus \alpha(*)$ then there is $h \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$ such that $[i < \kappa \Rightarrow h(i) \geq g^{**}(i)]$ and $\|h\|_D = \alpha$ and let $A = \{i < \kappa : h(i) < g^*(i)\}$. Now if $A \in (J_D(\bar{\lambda}, \kappa))^+$ we get a contradiction as there and if $A = \emptyset \bmod D$ we finish as there. So we are left with the case $A \in J_D(\bar{\lambda}, \kappa) \cap D^+$, $\|\bar{\lambda}\|_{D+A} > \|\bar{\lambda}\|_D \leq \lambda$ hence $\|g^{**}\|_{D+A} \leq \lambda$ hence $\|h\|_{D+A} \leq \lambda > \alpha$ hence necessarily $\|h\|_{D+(\kappa \setminus A)} = \alpha$ (as $\|h\|_D = \text{Min}\{\|h\|_{D+A}, \|h\|_{D+(\kappa \setminus A)}\}$). Now choose

$h' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$ by $h' \upharpoonright (\kappa \setminus A) = h \upharpoonright (\kappa \setminus A)$ and $[i \in A \Rightarrow h'(i) = \text{Min}(C_i'' \setminus h(i))]$ so

$h' \in \prod_{i < \kappa} C_i'', h \leq h' < \bar{\lambda}, \lambda \leq \|h\|_{D+A} \leq \|h'\|_{D+A} \leq \|h'\|_{D+A}$ and so

$\|h'\|_D = \text{Min}\{\|h'\|_{D+A}, \|h'\|_{D+(\kappa \setminus A)}\} = \alpha$.

So we are done.

2) Let g^{**} be as in the proof of part (1). We let there

$$Y[\bar{X}] =: \left\{ \|h\|_{D+A} : h \in \prod_{i < \kappa} (\lambda_i \setminus g^{**}(i)) \text{ and } A \in I^+ \right\}$$

remembering $I = J_D(\bar{\lambda}, \kappa)$.

$$\mathcal{Y}[\bar{X}] =: \left\{ (h, A) / \approx_I : h \in \prod_{i < \kappa} (X_i \setminus g^{**}(i)) \text{ and } \right. \\ \left. (h, A) \in \text{cla}_I^\alpha(\lambda, D) \text{ for some } \alpha < \lambda \right\}$$

and we can restrict ourselves to sequences $\bar{X}$ such that $X_i \cap g^{**}(i) = \emptyset$. In the proof of $(*)_2$ make $g \geq g^{**}$. □?

→ scite{10.19} undefined

5.20 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) J is a filter on κ
- (b) λ a regular cardinal, $\lambda_i > 2^\kappa, \theta > 2^\kappa$
- (c) $\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i / J$ is λ -like i.e.
 - (i) $\lambda = \text{tcf } \prod \lambda_i / J$
 - (ii) $T_J(\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle) = \lambda$ (follows from (i) + (iii) actually) and
 - (iii) if $\mu_i < \lambda_i$ then $T_J(\langle \mu_i : i < \kappa \rangle) < \lambda$
- (d) $\kappa < \theta = \text{cf}(\theta) < \lambda_i$ for $i < \kappa$
- (e) $i < \kappa \Rightarrow S_\theta^{\lambda_i} = \{\delta < \lambda_i : \text{cf}(\delta) = \theta\} \in I[\lambda_i]$ (see below)
- (f) $(\forall \alpha < \theta)[|\alpha|^\kappa < \theta]$.

Then $S_\theta^\lambda = \{\delta < \lambda : \text{cf}(\delta) = \theta\} \in I[\lambda]$.

Remark. Remember that for λ regular uncountable

$$I[\lambda] = \left\{ A \subseteq \lambda : \text{for some club } E \text{ of } \lambda \bar{\mathcal{P}} = \langle \mathcal{P}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle, \right. \\ \mathcal{P}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\alpha), |\mathcal{P}| < \lambda \\ \text{for every } \delta \in A \cap E, \text{cf}(\delta) < \delta \text{ and for some closed} \\ \text{unbounded subset } a \text{ of } \delta \text{ of order type} \\ \left. < \delta, (\forall \alpha < \delta)(\exists \beta < \delta)(a \cap \alpha \in \mathcal{P}_\beta) \right\}.$$

Proof. Clearly each λ_i is a regular cardinal and $\lambda = \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i / J)$, so let

$\bar{f} = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be a $<_J$ -increasing sequence of members of $\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$, which is cofinal

in $\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i / J$. So without loss of generality if $\bar{f} \restriction \delta$ has a $<_J$ -eub f' then $f_\delta =_J f'$.

For each $i < \kappa$ (see the references above) we can find $\bar{e}^i = \langle e_\alpha^i : \alpha < \lambda_i \rangle$ and E_i such that:

- (i) E_i is a club of λ_i
- (ii) $e_\alpha^i \subseteq \alpha$ and $\text{otp}(e_\alpha^i) \leq \theta$
- (iii) if $\beta \in e_\alpha^i$ then $e_\beta^i = e_\alpha^i \cap \beta$
- (iv) if $\delta \in E_i$ and $\text{cf}(\delta) = \theta$, then $\delta = \sup(e_\delta^i)$.

Choose $\bar{N} = \langle N_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ such that $N_i \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in, <_\chi^*)$ where, e.g., $\chi = \beth_8(\lambda)^+$, $\|N_i\| < \lambda$, N_i is increasing continuous, $\bar{N} \restriction (i+1) \in N_{i+1}$, $N_i \cap \lambda$ is an ordinal, and $\{\bar{f}, J, \lambda, \langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle, \langle \bar{e}^i : i < \kappa \rangle\} \in N_0$. Let $E = \{\delta < \lambda : N_\delta \cap \lambda = \delta\}$, so it suffices to prove

(*) if $\delta \in E \cap S_\theta^\lambda$ then there is a such that:

- (i) $a \subseteq \delta$
- (ii) $\delta = \sup(a)$
- (iii) $|a| < \lambda_0$
- (iv) $\alpha < \delta \Rightarrow a \cap N_\alpha \in N_\delta$.

By clause (b) in the assumption necessarily $\bar{f} \restriction \delta$ has a $<_J$ -eub ($[\text{Sh:g, Ch.II, §1}]$) so necessarily f_δ is an $<_J$ -eub of $\bar{f} \restriction \delta$ hence $A^* = \{i < \kappa : \text{cf}(f_\delta(i)) = \theta\} = \kappa \bmod J$. By clause (f) of the assumption for each $i \in A^*$, $e_{f_\delta(i)}^i$ is well defined, and let $e_{f_\delta(i)}^i = \{\alpha_\zeta^i : \zeta < \theta\}$ with α_ζ^i increasing with ζ . For each $\zeta < \theta$ we have $\langle \alpha_\zeta^i : i < \kappa \rangle <_J f_\delta$ hence for some $\gamma(\zeta) < \delta$ we have $\langle \alpha_\zeta^i : i < \kappa \rangle <_J f_{\gamma(\zeta)}$, but $T_D(f_{\gamma(\zeta)}) < \lambda$ and $\gamma(\zeta) \in N_{\gamma(\zeta)+1}$ hence $f_{\gamma(\zeta)} \in N_{\gamma(\zeta)+1}$ hence for some $g_\zeta <_J f_{\gamma(\zeta)}$ we have: $g_\zeta \in N_{\gamma(\zeta)+1}$ and $A_\zeta = \{i < \kappa : g_\zeta(i) = \alpha_\zeta^i\} \neq \emptyset \bmod J$. As $\theta = \text{cf}(\theta) > 2^\kappa$ for some $A \subseteq \kappa$ we have $B = \{\zeta < \theta : A_\zeta = A\}$ is unbounded in θ .

Now for $\zeta < \theta$ let

$$a_\zeta = \left\{ \text{Min}\{\gamma < \lambda : \neg(f_\gamma \leq_{J+(\kappa \setminus A)} g)\} : \right. \\ \left. g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \{\alpha_\varepsilon^i : \varepsilon < \zeta\} = \prod_{i < \kappa} e_{(\alpha_\zeta^i)}^i \right\}.$$

Clearly $\zeta < \xi < \theta \Rightarrow a_\zeta \subseteq a_\xi$. Also for $\zeta < \theta$, a_ζ is definable from $\bar{f}$ and $g_\zeta \restriction A$, hence belongs to $N_{\gamma(\zeta)+1}$, but its cardinality is $\leq \theta + 2^\kappa < \lambda$ hence it is a subset of $N_{\gamma(\zeta)+1}$. Moreover, also $\langle a_\xi : \xi < \zeta \rangle$ is definable from $\bar{f}$ and $\langle \{\alpha_\varepsilon^i : \varepsilon < \xi\} : i < A \rangle : \xi \leq \zeta \rangle$ hence from $\bar{f}$ and $g_\zeta \restriction A$ and $\langle \bar{e}^i : i < \kappa \rangle$, all of

which belong to $N_0 \prec N_{\gamma(\zeta)+1}$, hence $\zeta \in B \Rightarrow \langle a_\xi : \xi \leq \zeta \rangle \in N_{\gamma(\zeta)+1}$, is a bounded subset of δ . Now

(*) $\bigcup_{\xi < \theta} a_\xi$ is unbounded in δ
 [why? let $\beta < \delta$ so for some $\zeta < \theta$ we have:

$$f_\beta(i) < f_\delta(i) \Rightarrow f_\beta(i) < \alpha_\zeta^i < f_\delta(i)$$

so

$$\text{Min}\{\gamma : \neg(f_\gamma \leq_{J+(\kappa \setminus A)} \langle \alpha_\zeta^i : i < \kappa \rangle)\} \in (\beta, \delta) \cap a_{\zeta+1}.$$

Let $w = \{\zeta < \theta : a_\zeta \text{ is bounded in } a_{\zeta+1}\}$

$$a'_\zeta = \{\text{Min}\{\gamma \in a_{\xi+1} : \gamma \text{ is an upper bound of } a_\xi\} : \xi < \zeta\}.$$

So $\cup\{a'_\zeta : \zeta < \theta\}$ is as required. $\square_{5.20}$

→ *5.21 Remark.* 1) If we want to weaken clause (c) in claim ? retaining only (i) there
 scite{10.20} undefined
 (and omitting (ii) + (iii)), it is enough if we add:

(g) for each $i < \kappa$ and $\delta \in S_\theta^{\lambda_i}$, $\{\gamma < \delta : \text{cf}(\gamma) > \kappa \text{ and } \gamma \in e_\delta^i\}$ is a stationary subset of δ .

2) In part (1) of this remark, we can apply $\text{cf}(\gamma) > \kappa$ by $\text{cf}(\gamma) = \sigma$, if D is σ^+ -complete or at least not σ -incomplete.

3) This is particularly interesting if $\lambda = \mu^+ = \text{pp}(\mu)$.

§6 THE CLASS OF CARDINAL ULTRAPRODUCTS MODULO D

We presently concentrate on ultrafilters (for filters: two versions). This continues [Sh 506, §3], see history there and in [CK], [Sh:g].

6.1 *Fact.* Assume

- (a) D is an ultrafilter on κ and $\theta = \text{reg}(D)$
- (b) $\mu = \text{cf}(\mu)$ and $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{< \text{reg}(D)} < \mu$
- (c) $\bar{n} = \langle n_i : i < \kappa \rangle, 0 < n_i < \omega, A^* = \bigcup_{i < \kappa} (\{i\} \times n_i)$
- (d) $Y \in D \Rightarrow \mu \leq \max \text{pcf}\{\lambda_{i,n} : i \in Y, n < n_i\}$
- (e) for each $i < \kappa, n < n_i$ we have $\lambda_{(i,n)}$ is regular $> \kappa$ strictly increasing with n , stipulating $\lambda_{(i,n_i)} = \mu$.

Then for some $\langle m_i : i < \kappa \rangle \in \prod_{i < \kappa} (n_i + 1)$ we have:

- (α) $\mu \leq \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_{(i,m_i)} / D)$
- (β) $\mu > \max \text{pcf}\{\lambda_{(i,n)} : i < \kappa \text{ and } n < m_i\}$.

Proof. We try to choose by induction on $\zeta < \text{reg}(D)$, B_ζ and $\langle n_i^\zeta : i < \kappa \rangle$ such that:

- (i) $B_\zeta \in D$
- (ii) $n_i^\zeta < n_i$ non-decreasing in ζ
- (iii) $B_\zeta = \{i : n_i^\zeta < n_i^{\zeta+1}\}$ and
- (iv) $\max \text{pcf}\{\lambda_{(i,n)} : i < \kappa \text{ and } n \leq n_i^\zeta\} < \mu$.

If we succeed, then $\{B_\zeta : \zeta < \text{reg}(D)\}$ exemplifies D is $\text{reg}(D)$ -regular, contradiction. During the induction we choose B_ζ in step $\zeta + 1$. For $\zeta = 0$ try $n_i^\zeta = 0$, if this fails then $m_i = 0$ (for $i < \kappa$) is as required. For ζ limit let $n_i^\zeta = n_i^\xi$ for every $\xi < \zeta$ large enough, this is O.K. as

$$\max \text{pcf}\{\lambda_{(i,n)} : i < \kappa \text{ and } n < n_i^\zeta\} \leq \prod_{\xi < \zeta} \max \text{pcf}\{\lambda_{(i,n)} : i < \kappa \text{ and } n \leq n_i^\xi\} < \mu$$

by assumption (b). Lastly, for $\zeta = \xi + 1$, $\{i < \kappa : n_i^\xi < n_i\} \in D$ (otherwise contradiction as $\lambda_{(i,n_i)} = \mu$ and assumption (d)), and if $\mu \leq \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_{n_i^\xi+1} / D)$ we are

done with $m_i = n_i^\xi + 1$, if not there is $B_\xi \in D$ such that $\max \text{pcf}\{\lambda_{n_i^\xi+1} : i \in B_\xi\} < \mu$ and let

$$n_i^\zeta = \begin{cases} n_i^\xi + 1 & \text{if } i \in B_\xi, n_i^\xi < n_i \\ n_i^\xi & \text{if otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

□_{6.1}

6.2 Lemma. *Assume*

- (i) D is an ultrafilter on κ
- (ii) $\mu = \text{cf}(\mu)$ and $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{< \text{reg}(D)} < \mu$
- (iii) at least one of the following occurs:
 - (α) $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{\text{reg}(D)} < \mu$
 - (β) D is closed under decreasing sequences of length θ .

Then there is a minimal g/D such that:

$$\mu = \text{tcf} \left(\prod_{i < \kappa} g(i)/D \right) \text{ and } \bigwedge_{i < \kappa} \text{cf}(g(i)) > \kappa.$$

We shall prove it somewhat later.

6.3 Remark. 1) Note that necessarily (in 6.2)

$$\{i < \kappa : g(i) \text{ a regular cardinal}\} \in D.$$

2) g is also $<_D$ -minimal under: $\mu \leq \text{tcf} \left(\prod_{i < \kappa} g(i)/D \right) \ \& \ \{i : \text{cf}(g(i)) > \kappa\} \in D$.

[Why? assume $g' <_D g$, $\mu \leq \text{tcf} \left(\prod_{i < \kappa} g'(i)/D \right)$, and $X = \{i : \text{cf}(g(i)) \leq \kappa\} =$

$\emptyset \bmod D$; clearly $\mu \leq \text{tcf} \left(\prod_{i < \kappa} \text{cf}(g'(i))/D \right)$. If $\text{Lim}_D \text{cf}(g'(i))$ is singular, by

[Sh:g, II,1.5A] for some $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$, we have $\mu = \text{tcf}(\prod \lambda_i/D)$ and $\text{Lim}_D \lambda_i = \text{Lim}_D \text{cf}(g(i))$ and $(\forall i)[\text{cf}(g(i)) > \kappa \rightarrow \lambda_i \geq \kappa]$, so again without loss of generality $\bigwedge_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i > \kappa$. Now $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ contradicts the choice of g . If $\text{Lim}_D \text{cf}(g(i))$

is regular, it is μ and all is easier].

3) If $|\kappa^\kappa/D| < \mu$ then we can omit (in 6.2 and 6.3(2)) the clause “ $\{i : \text{cf}(g(i)) > \kappa\} \in D$ ”.

6.4 Conclusion. If assumptions (i)-(iii) of 6.2 hold and

$$(iv) \ \mu > 2^\kappa$$

then without loss of generality each $g(i)$ is a regular cardinal and $\left(\prod_{i < \kappa} g(i)/D, <_D \right)$ is μ -like (i.e. of cardinality μ but every proper initial segment has smaller cardinality).

6.5 Remark. We use $\mu > 2^\kappa$ in 6.4 rather than $\mu > |\kappa^\kappa/D|$ as 6.3(3) (which concerns 6.2, 6.3(3)) as the proof of 6.4 uses 1.4.

Proof of 6.4. If D is $\aleph_1$ -complete this is trivial, so assume not hence $\text{reg}(D) > \aleph_0$.

Let $g \in {}^\kappa(\mu + 1)$ be as in 6.2, so without loss of generality as in 6.3(2), and remember 6.3(1) so without loss of generality each $g(i)$ is a regular cardinal. Clearly $\prod_{i < \kappa} g(i)$ has cardinality $\geq \mu$. Assume first $\mu = \chi^+$.

Let $g' < \prod_{i < \kappa} g(i)$, then by 6.3(3) and choice of g

$$\sup\{\text{tcf } \prod \lambda_i / D : \lambda_i \leq g'(i) \text{ for } i < \kappa\} \leq \chi.$$

But as $\text{reg}(D) > \aleph_0$ by clause (ii) of the assumption we have $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{\aleph_0} < \mu$ so 2.6 applies and $|\prod_{i < \kappa} g'(i) / D| \leq \chi$, so really $\prod_{i < \kappa} g(i) / D$ is μ -like.

If μ is not a successor, then it is weakly inaccessible and $\mu = \sup(Z)$, where $Z = \{\chi^+ : \kappa^\kappa / D < \chi^{\aleph_0} = \chi < \mu\}$, so for each $\chi \in Z$ we can find $g_\chi \in {}^\kappa(\mu + 1)$ such that $\prod_{i < \kappa} g_\chi(i) / D$ is χ -like so necessarily for $\chi_1 < \chi_2$ in Z we have $g_{\chi_1} <_D g_{\chi_2}$. It is enough to find a $<_D$ -lub for $\langle f_\chi : \chi \in Z \rangle$, and as $\mu > 2^\kappa$ this is immediate. $\square_{6.4}$

Proof of 6.2. First try to choose, by induction on α, f_α such that:

- (A) $f_\alpha \in {}^\kappa(\mu + 1)$
- (B) $\mu = \text{tcf} \left(\prod_{i < \kappa} f_\alpha(i) / D \right)$
- (C) $\beta < \alpha \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_D f_\beta$
- (D) each $f_\alpha(i)$ is a regular cardinal $> \kappa$.

Necessarily for some α^* we have: f_α is well defined iff $\alpha < \alpha^*$. Now α^* cannot be zero as the constant function with value μ can serve as f_0 . Also if α^* is a successor ordinal, say $\alpha^* = \beta + 1$, then f_β is as required in the desired conclusion.

So α^* is a limit ordinal, and by passing to a subsequence, without loss of generality $\alpha^* = \text{cf}(\alpha^*)$ and call it θ . Without loss of generality

$$(E) \quad \mu = \max \text{pcf}\{f_\alpha(i) : i < \kappa\}.$$

We now try to choose by induction on $\zeta < \text{reg}(D)$ the objects $\alpha_\zeta, A_\zeta, \mathfrak{b}_\zeta$ such that:

- (a) $\alpha_\zeta < \theta$ is strictly increasing with ζ
- (b) $A_\zeta \in D$
- (c) $\mathfrak{b}_\zeta \subseteq \{f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi \leq \zeta, \text{ and } i \in A_\xi\}$
- (d) $\mathfrak{b}_\zeta$ is increasing with ζ
- (e) $\max \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{b}_\zeta) < \mu$
- (f) for each i the sequence $\langle f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi \leq \zeta \text{ and } i \in A_\xi \text{ and } f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \notin \mathfrak{b}_\zeta \rangle$ is strictly decreasing
- (g) $\alpha_0 = 0, A_0 = \kappa, \mathfrak{b}_\zeta = \emptyset$
- (h) $\alpha_{\zeta+1} = \alpha_\zeta + 1$ and $A_{\zeta+1} = \{i \in A_\zeta : f_{\alpha_{\zeta+1}}(i) < f_{\alpha_\zeta}(i) \text{ and } f_{\alpha_\zeta}(i) \in \mathfrak{b}_\zeta\}$

(i) for ζ limit, α_ζ is the first $\alpha < \theta$ which is $\geq \bigcup_{\varepsilon \leq \zeta} \alpha_\varepsilon$ such that for some $B \in D$

we have:

$$\mu > \max \text{pcf}\{f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi < \zeta, i \in A_\xi \text{ and } i \in B \text{ and } f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \leq f_\alpha(i)\}$$

(j) $\mathfrak{b}_{\zeta+1} = \mathfrak{b}_\zeta$

(k) for ζ limit A_ζ satisfies the requirements on B in clause (i) and

$$\mathfrak{b}_\zeta = \bigcup_{\varepsilon < \zeta} \mathfrak{b}_\varepsilon \bigcup \{f_\xi(i) : \xi < \zeta \text{ and } i \in A_\zeta, A_\xi \cap A_\zeta \text{ and } f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \leq f_{\alpha_\zeta}(i)\}$$

(l) for $\xi \leq \zeta$ we have $\{i \in A_\xi : f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \notin \mathfrak{b}_\zeta\} \in D$.

So for some $\zeta^* \leq \text{reg}(D)$ we have $(\alpha_\zeta, A_\zeta, \mathfrak{b}_\zeta)$ is well defined iff $\zeta < \zeta^*$.

We check the different cases and get a contradiction in each (so α^* had necessarily been a successor ordinal giving the desired conclusion).

CASE 1: $\zeta^* = 0$.

We choose $\alpha_0 = 0, A_0 = \kappa, \mathfrak{b}_0 = \emptyset$; so clause (g) holds, first part of clause (a) (i.e. $\alpha_\zeta < \theta$) holds, clause (b) and clause (c) are totally trivial, clause (e) holds as $\max \text{pcf}(\emptyset) = 0$ (formally we should have written $\sup \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{b}_\zeta)$), clause (f) speaks on the empty sequence, and the other clauses are empty in this case.

CASE 2: $\zeta^* = \zeta + 1$.

We choose $\alpha_{\zeta^*} = \alpha_{\zeta+1} = \alpha_\zeta + 1, A_{\zeta^*} = \{i \in A_\zeta : f_{\alpha_{\zeta^*}+1}(i) < f_{\alpha_\zeta}(i) \text{ and } f_{\alpha_\zeta}(i) \notin \mathfrak{b}_\zeta\}$ and $\mathfrak{b}_{\zeta+1} \supseteq \mathfrak{b}_\zeta$ is defined by clause (j). Clearly $\alpha_\zeta < \alpha_{\zeta+1} < \theta$ and $A_{\zeta+1} \in D$ as $A_\zeta \in D$ and $f_{\alpha_{\zeta+1}} <_D f_{\alpha_\zeta}$ and $\{i : f_{\alpha_\zeta}(i) \notin \mathfrak{b}_\zeta\} \in D$ by clause (ell); so clause (b) holds. Now clause (a) holds trivially and clauses (g) and (i) are irrelevant. Clause (h) holds by our choice.

For clause (f), the new cases are when $f_{\alpha_{\zeta+1}}(i)$ appears in the sequence, i.e., $i \in A_{\zeta+1}$ such that $f_{\alpha_{\zeta+1}}(i) \notin \bigcup_{\xi \leq \zeta+1} \mathfrak{b}_\xi = \mathfrak{b}_{\zeta+1} = \mathfrak{b}_\zeta$ but $i \in A_{\zeta+1} \Rightarrow i \in A_\zeta$ & $f_{\alpha_\zeta}(i) \notin \mathfrak{b}_\zeta$ so also $f_{\alpha_\zeta}(i)$ appears in the sequence and as $i \in A_{\zeta+1} \Rightarrow f_{\alpha_\zeta}(i) > f_{\alpha_{\zeta+1}}(i) = f_{\alpha_{\zeta+1}}(i)$ plus the induction hypothesis; we are done.

As for clause (l) for $\xi \leq \zeta + 1$, clearly

$\{i \in A_\xi : f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \notin \mathfrak{b}_{\zeta+1}\} = A_\xi \cap \{i < \kappa : f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \notin \mathfrak{b}_{\zeta+1}\}$. Now the first belongs to D by clause (b) proved above and the second belongs to D as $\max \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{b}_{\zeta+1}) < \mu$

by clause (e) proved below as $\text{tcf}\left(\prod_{i < \kappa} f_{\alpha_\xi}(i)/D\right) = \mu$ by clause (B).

We have chosen $\mathfrak{b}_{\zeta+1} = \mathfrak{b}_\zeta$, so (using the induction hypothesis) clauses (c), (d), (e) trivially hold and also clause (j) holds by the choice of $\mathfrak{b}_{\zeta^*}$, and (k) irrelevant so we are done.

CASE 3: $\zeta^* = \zeta$ is a limit ordinal $< \text{reg}(D)$.

Let $\mathfrak{b}_\zeta = \bigcup_{\xi < \zeta} \mathfrak{b}_\xi$, so clause (j) holds; also clauses (c), (d) hold trivially and clause

(e) holds by basic pcf:

$$\max \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{b}_\zeta) \leq \prod_{\xi < \zeta} \max \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{b}_\xi) < \mu$$

as

$$\mu = \text{cf}(\mu) \ \& \ (\forall \alpha < \mu)[|\alpha|^{< \text{reg}(D)} < \mu] \ \& \ \zeta < \text{reg}(D).$$

Now we try to define α_ζ by clause (i).

SUBCASE 3A: α_ζ is not well defined.

Let $w_i = \{\xi < \zeta : i \in A_\xi \text{ and } f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \notin \mathfrak{b}_\zeta\}$. Note that by the induction hypothesis (clause (f)) for each $\varepsilon < \zeta$ and $i < \kappa$ we have the sequence $\langle f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi < \varepsilon \text{ and } i \in A_\xi \text{ and } f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \notin \mathfrak{b}_\varepsilon \rangle$ is strictly decreasing, so as $\mathfrak{b}_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathfrak{b}_\zeta$ clearly $\langle f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi < \varepsilon \text{ and } \xi \in w_i \rangle$ is strictly decreasing. As this holds for each $\varepsilon < \zeta$ and ζ is a limit ordinal, clearly $\langle f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi \in w_i \rangle$ is strictly decreasing hence w_i is finite.

Now for each $B \in D$ we have (first inequality by the assumption of the subcase, second by the definition of the w_i 's)

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &\leq \max \text{pcf} \left\{ f_\xi(i) : \xi < \zeta, i \in A_\xi \text{ and } i \in B \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \max \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{b}_\zeta), \max \text{pcf} \{ f_\xi(i) : \xi \in w_i \text{ and } i \in B \} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\max \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{b}_\zeta) < \mu$ as said above, hence necessarily

$$(*) \ B \in D \Rightarrow \mu \leq \max \text{pcf} \{ f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi \in w_i \text{ and } i \in B \}.$$

As w_i is finite and each $f_\alpha(i)$ is a regular cardinal $> \kappa$ we have $\{i : w_i \neq \emptyset\} \in D$.

By Claim 6.1 (the case there of $\{i : m_i = n_i\} \in D$ is impossible by $(*)$ above) we can find $g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} w_i/D$, more exactly $g \in {}^\kappa \text{Ord}, w_i \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow g(i) \in w_i$ and $B \in D$

such that:

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha) \quad \mu &\leq \text{tcf} \left(\prod_{i < \kappa} g(i)/D \right) \\ (\beta) \quad \mu &> \max \text{pcf} \{ f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi \in w_i \text{ and } i \in B \text{ and } f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) < g(i) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Now by the choice of $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \theta \rangle$ and clause (α) necessarily (and [Sh:g, Ch.II,1.5A]) for some $\alpha < \theta$ we have $f_\alpha <_D g$. Now let $B_\alpha^\xi = \{i < \kappa : f_\alpha(i) \geq f_{\alpha_\xi}(i)\}$, if $B_\alpha^\xi \in D$ then $B^* = \{i < \kappa : \xi \in w_i \text{ and } i \in B \text{ and } g_\alpha(i) > f_{\alpha_\xi}(i)\} \supseteq \{i < \kappa : i \in A_\xi\} \cap \{i < \kappa : f_\alpha(i) \notin \mathfrak{b}_\zeta\} \cap \{i < \kappa : f_\alpha(i) \geq f_{\alpha_\xi}(i)\}$ which is the intersection of three members of D hence belongs to D , but $\{f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : i \in B^*\}$ is included in the set in the right side of clause (β) hence $\mu > \max \text{pcf} \{ f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : i \in B^* \}$ contradicting $B^* \in D$, $\text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \kappa} f_{\alpha_\xi}(i)/D) = \mu$. So necessarily $B_\alpha^\xi \notin D$, hence $f_\alpha <_D f_{\alpha_\xi}$ hence $\alpha < \alpha_\xi$. So

$\bigcup_{\xi < \zeta} \alpha_\xi < \alpha < \theta$. Let $B' = B \cap \{i < \kappa : f_\alpha(i) < g(i)\}$ so $B' \in D$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi < w_i \text{ and } i \in B' \text{ and } f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \leq f_\alpha(i) \right\} \subseteq \\ &\quad \left\{ f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi < w_i \text{ and } i \in B \text{ and } f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) < g(i) \right\} \subseteq \\ &\quad \mathfrak{b}_\zeta \cup \left\{ f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi \in w_i \text{ and } f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) < g(i) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \text{pcf} \left\{ f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi < \zeta, i \in A_\xi \text{ and } i \in B' \text{ and } f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \leq f_\alpha(i) \right\} \leq \\ & \max \left\{ \max \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{b}_\zeta), \max \text{pcf} \{ f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi \in w_i \text{ and } i \in B \text{ and } \right. \\ & \quad \left. f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) < g(i) \} \right\} < \mu \end{aligned}$$

(the first term is $< \mu$ as clause (e) was proved in the beginning of Case 3, the second term is $< \mu$ by clause (β)). So α is as required in clause (i) so α_ζ is well defined; contradiction.

CASE 3B: α_ζ is well defined.

Let $B \in D$ exemplify it. We choose A_ζ as B and we define $\mathfrak{b}_\zeta$ by clause (k).

Now clause (a) follows from clause (i) (which holds by the assumption of the subcase), clause (b) holds by the choice of B (and of A_ζ), clause (c) by the choice of $\mathfrak{b}_\zeta$, clause (d) by the choice of $\mathfrak{b}_\zeta$, clause (e) by the choice of $\mathfrak{b}_\zeta$. Now for clause (f) by the induction hypothesis and clause (d) we should consider only $f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) > f_{\alpha_\zeta}(i)$ when $\xi < \zeta, i \in A_\xi \cap A_\zeta$ and $f_{\alpha_\xi}(i), f_{\alpha_\zeta}(i) \notin \mathfrak{b}_\zeta$, but clauses (i) + (k) (i.e. the choice of $\mathfrak{b}_\zeta$) take care of this clauses (g), (h), (j) are irrelevant and (l) follows from (e).

So we are done.

CASE 4: $\zeta^* = \text{reg}(D)$.

The proof is split according to the two cases in the assumption (iii).

SUBCASE 4A: $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{\text{reg}(D)} < \mu$.

Let $\mathfrak{b} = \cup \{ \mathfrak{b}_\xi : \xi < \zeta^* \}$ so $\max \text{pcf}(\mathfrak{b}) < \mu$, hence for each $\xi < \zeta^*$ we have $A'_\xi = \{ i \in A_\xi : f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \notin \mathfrak{b} \} \in D$. Let $w_i = \{ \xi < \zeta^* : i \in A'_\xi \text{ and } f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \notin \mathfrak{b} \}$. Now for any $\zeta < \zeta^*$ and $i < \kappa$ the sequence $\langle f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi < \zeta \text{ and } \xi \in w_i \rangle$ is strictly decreasing (by clause (f)) hence $\langle f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) : \xi < \zeta^* \text{ and } \xi \in w_i \rangle$ is strictly decreasing hence w_i is finite. Also for each $\xi < \zeta^*$ the set A'_ξ belongs to D , so $\{ A'_\xi : \xi < \zeta^* \}$ exemplifies D is $|\zeta^*|$ -regular, but $\zeta^* = \text{reg}(D)$, contradiction.

SUBCASE 4B: D is closed under decreasing sequences of length $\text{reg}(D)$.

Let $\mathfrak{b} = \bigcup_{\zeta < \zeta^*} \mathfrak{b}_\zeta$.

In this case, for each $\xi < \zeta^*$, the sequence $\langle \{ i \in A_\xi : f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \notin \mathfrak{b}_\zeta \} : \zeta \in [\xi, \zeta^*] \rangle$ is a decreasing sequence of length $\zeta^* = \text{reg}(D)$ of members of D so the intersection, $A'_\xi = \{ i \in A_\xi : f_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \notin \mathfrak{b} \} \in D$, and we continue as in the first subcase. $\square_{6.2}$

6.6 Definition. 1) For an ultrafilter D on κ let $\text{reg}'(D)$ be: $\text{reg}(D)$ if D is closed under intersection of decreasing sequences of length $\text{reg}(D)$ and $(\text{reg}(D))^+$ otherwise. 2) $\text{reg}''(D)$ is: $\text{reg}(D)$ if (a)⁻ below holds and $(\text{reg}(D))^+$ otherwise

(a) $\text{reg}'(D) = \text{reg}(D)$ or just

(a)⁻ letting $\theta = \text{reg}(D)$, in θ^κ/D there is a $<_D$ -first function above the constant functions.

6.7 Theorem. *If D is an ultrafilter on κ and $\theta = \text{reg}'(D)$ then
 $\mu = \mu^{<\theta} \geq |2^\kappa/D| \Rightarrow \mu \in \{\prod \lambda_i/D : \lambda_i \in \text{Card}\}$.*

Proof. Apply Lemma 6.4 with D, κ, μ^+ here standing for D, κ, μ there; note that assumption (iii) there holds as the definition of $\text{reg}'(D)(= \theta)$ was chosen appropriately.

Let $g^*/D = \langle \lambda_i^* : i < \kappa \rangle$ be as there, so as $\left(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i^*/D \right)$ is μ^+ -like, for some $f \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$, we have $|\prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)/D| = \mu$ as required. $\square_{6.7}$

Remark. Can $\text{reg}'(D) \neq \text{reg}(D)$? This is equivalent to: D is not closed under intersections of decreasing sequences of length $\theta = \text{reg}(D)$. So if $\text{reg}'(D) \neq \text{reg}(D) = \theta$ then θ is regular and for some function $\mathbf{i} : \kappa \rightarrow \theta$ the ultrafilter $D' = \{A \subseteq \theta : \mathbf{i}^{-1}(A) \in D\}$ is an ultrafilter on θ , with $\text{reg}(D') = \theta$ so D' is not regular.

This leads to the well known problem (Kanamori [Kn]) if D is a uniform ultrafilter on κ with $\text{reg}(D) = \kappa$ does κ^κ/D have a first function above the constant ones.

6.8 Fact. If $\mu = \theta = \text{reg}(D) < \text{reg}'(D)$, $\mu = \sum_{i < \theta} \mu_i, \mu_i^\kappa = \mu_i < \mu_{i+1}$ and

$$|\prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)/D| \geq \mu \text{ then } |\prod_{i < \kappa} f(i)/D| \geq \mu^\theta = \mu^\kappa.$$

REFERENCES.

- [Bay] Timothy James Bays. *Multi-cardinal phenomena in stable theories*. PhD thesis, UCLA, 1994.
- [CK] Chen C. Chang and Jerome H. Keisler. *Model Theory*, volume 73 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundation of Math*. North Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1973.
- [CuSh 541] James Cummings and Saharon Shelah. Cardinal invariants above the continuum. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, **75**:251–268, 1995.
- [For] Matthew Foreman. ??? PhD thesis.
- [Kn] Akihiro Kanamori. Weakly normal filters and irregular ultra-filters. *Trans. of A.M.S.*, **220**:393–396, 1976.
- [LMSh 198] Jean Pierre Levinski, Menachem Magidor, and Saharon Shelah. Chang’s conjecture for $\aleph_\omega$. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **69**:161–172, 1990.
- [MgSh 433] Menachem Magidor and Saharon Shelah. Length of Boolean algebras and ultraproducts. *Mathematica Japonica*, **accepted**.
- [M] Donald Monk. Cardinal functions of Boolean algebras. circulated notes.
- [RoSh 534] Andrzej Rosłanowski and Saharon Shelah. Cardinal invariants of ultraproducts of Boolean algebras. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **155**:101–151, 1998.
- [Sh 506] Saharon Shelah. In *The Mathematics of Paul Erdős, II*.
- [Sh 513] Saharon Shelah. PCF and infinite free subsets. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, **accepted**.
- [Sh 620] Saharon Shelah. Special Subsets of ${}^{\text{cf}(\mu)}\mu$, Boolean Algebras and Maharam measure Algebras. *General Topology and its Applications - Proc. of Prague Topological Symposium 1996*, **accepted**.
- [Sh:a] Saharon Shelah. *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, volume 92 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, xvi+544 pp, \$62.25, 1978.
- [Sh 71] Saharon Shelah. A note on cardinal exponentiation. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **45**:56–66, 1980.
- [Sh 111] Saharon Shelah. On power of singular cardinals. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, **27**:263–299, 1986.
- [Sh:c] Saharon Shelah. *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, volume 92 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, xxxiv+705 pp, 1990.
- [Sh 351] Saharon Shelah. Reflecting stationary sets and successors of singular cardinals. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, **31**:25–53, 1991.

- [Sh 355] Saharon Shelah. $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ has a Jonsson Algebra. In *Cardinal Arithmetic*, volume 29 of *Oxford Logic Guides*, chapter II. Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [Sh:g] Saharon Shelah. *Cardinal Arithmetic*, volume 29 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [Sh 430] Saharon Shelah. Further cardinal arithmetic. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **95**:61–114, 1996.
- [Sh 497] Saharon Shelah. Set Theory without choice: not everything on cofinality is possible. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, **36**:81–125, 1997. A special volume dedicated to Prof. Azriel Levy.